

JPRS-TAC-85-038

9 October 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

9 October 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Moscow Assails U.S. September ASAT Test (Various sources, various dates)	1
Plans Condemned	1
U.S. Sources Cited	2
Test Conducted	2
'Star Wars' Begins	3
'At Variance' With Assurances, by Boris Kalyagin	4
Compared to First A-Bomb Test, by Valentin Zorin	5
Impact on Bilateral Ties	6
Cosmonauts Speak Out	7
Linked to Space Command	8
Destruction of Existing Systems Proposed, by Ye. Nikitin	9
TASS Cites L'HUMANITE	10
Violates ABM Treaty, by Edward Mnatsakanov	11
International Criticism, by Igor Charikov	12
Gorbachev: ASAT Freeze 'Null, Void'	13
Victory for Hawks, Defense Firms	13
Functioning Satellite Destroyed	16
 TASS: U.S. SALT Negotiators Say U.S. Stance Hampers Arms Control (Moscow TASS, 14 Sep 85)	 18
 TASS Analyst Sees U.S. 'Anti-Soviet' Moves Before Summit (Moscow TASS, 25 Sep 85)	 19
 Soviet Initiatives Contrasted With U.S. Propaganda (Tomas Kolesnichenko; Moscow Television Service, 15 Sep 85)	21
 TASS: U.S. 'Misleading Public Opinion' on ABM Treaty (Moscow TASS, 24 Sep 85)	 23
 TASS Hits Weinberger SDI Comments in CBS Interview (Moscow TASS International Service, 16 Sep 85)	 24

TASS on McFarlane CBS Interview on Continuing SDI (Moscow TASS, 23 Sep 85)	25
TASS Assails Expansion of U.S. Military Space Programs (Moscow TASS, 13 Sep 85)	26
Moscow on Reasons Behind U.S. Moves to Deploy Space Arms (Yevgeniy Yegorov; Moscow World Service, 22 Sep 85)	28
TASS: U.S. Stresses SDI Importance, France Rejects Idea (Moscow TASS, 17 Sep 85)	30
Briefs	
French Defense Space Chief	31
CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE	
Moscow Reports on Prospects of Seventh Session (Moscow Domestic Service, 10 Sep 85)	32
Briefs	
Polish, Soviet Delegates' Speeches	33
General Tatarnikov Addresses Conference	33
Grinevskiy Addresses Plenary Session	33
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Moscow Counters State Department Official on SS-20 Deployment (Moscow World Service, 18 Sep 85)	35
TASS: U.S. 'Cover Up' of Number of European Missiles (Moscow TASS, 18 Sep 85)	36
TASS Criticizes Continued Missile Deployment in Europe (Moscow TASS International Service, 18 Sep 85)	37
PRAVDA: Dutch Opposition to Missile Deployment Steadfast (V. Drobkov; Moscow PRAVDA, 7 Sep 85)	39
Moscow Calls Deployment in Netherlands 'Inevitable' (Dmitriy Biryukov; Moscow Television Service, 27 Sep 85)	42
USSR: Claims of U.S. Nuclear Stockpiles in Turkey Viewed (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Sep 85)	43
Moscow on Threat of U.S. Nuclear Presence in Turkey (Moscow in Turkish to Turkey, 19 Sep 85)	44
Briefs	
TASS on U.S.-FRG Plans	46

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS: 27 September Test Highlights U.S. Arms Policy (Moscow TASS, 29 Sep 85)	47
USSR: U.S. Nuclear Test Affects Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Aleksandr Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 13 Sep 85)	49
Soviet General Chervov Views U.S. Rejection of Moratorium (Nikolay Chervov Interview; Prague RUDE PRAVO, 14 Sep 85)	51
PRAVDA Hits U.S. Response on Test Moratorium, 'Star Peace' (A. Tolkunov; Moscow PRAVDA, 31 Aug 85)	54
PRAVDA Cites Foreign, U.S. Support for Moratorium (Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Sep 85)	58
Soviet Army Paper: Moratorium Can Help Slow Arms Race (Ye. Nikitin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 25 Aug 85)	60
Australia Hosts Pacific Peace Talks To Focus on French Tests (Hong Kong AFP, 25 Sep 85)	64
Briefs	
Australian Test Monitoring Center	66
Australian Lawyer Criticizes UK Statement	66

GENERAL

Moscow Weekly Talk Show: UN, SDI, Chemical-Arms-Free Zone (Moscow Domestic Service, 15 Sep 85)	67
UN General Assembly	67
Arms Control	68
Strategic Defense Initiative	69
Gorbachev-Rau Meeting	70
PRAVDA Examines Tasks Facing 40th UNGA Session (Editorial; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Sep 85)	71
TASS Reports UN Speeches on Disarmament, Space Weapons (Moscow TASS, 25 Sep 85)	75
PRAVDA Weekly Review on Detente, Arms Issues (Nikolay Kurdyumov; Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Sep 85)	77
Moscow: U.S. Obstructs Disarmament With Propaganda Claims (Moscow Radio Peace and Progress to China, 14 Sep 85) ...	80

USSR Weekly Views SIPRI's Work on Arms Control (V. Pavlov; Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA, No 34, 16 Aug 85)	82
Soviet Scientists Publish Book on Nuclear War Effects (Moscow TASS, 13 Sep 85)	86
Moscow TV Hits Pentagon Report on Nuclear Winter, SDI (Igor Fesuenko; Moscow Television Service, 6 Sep 85)	87
TASS Analyst Criticizes McFarlane Speech (Moscow TASS, 17 Sep 85)	88
Ponomarev Receives U.S. Congressmen 24 September (Moscow TASS, 24 Sep 85)	90
USSR: U.S. Arms Stance Threatens Strategic Stability (Lev Semeyko; Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA, No 37, 6 Sep 85)	92

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ASSAILS U.S. SEPTEMBER ASAT TEST

Plans Condemned

LD051653 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 5 Sep 85

[Text] The United States administration has decided to test its anti-satellite system ASAT shortly against a real target in space. Commentary is by Aleksandr Pogodin.

[Announcer read] What is ASAT like and what consequences may follow the testing of this system? Let's begin with the military and technical side of the matter. The system includes a carrier aircraft and a 2-stage missile. The complex is intended to intercept and destroy satellites. For this purpose the aircraft takes the missile to an altitude of some 20 kilometers. The missile must approach a target in space automatically and destroy it. This is how the American press describes ASAT.

What do ASAT tests mean politically and militarily? Well, as a matter of fact, the United States is going to take a concrete step toward militarizing space by projecting the arms race to it. When it decided to hold tests it violated international agreements and understandings. It is quite obvious that the tests are intended to master a system of anti-missile weapons based on the air and elsewhere--even though this is banned by the Soviet-American treaty on anti-missile defense, one of the few agreements limiting the arms race.

You may know that when the Soviet Union and the United States reached agreement to hold talks in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments they pledged to press to prevent the project of the arms race into space. Another round of these talks is to begin soon. Has not Washington deliberately chosen this time to adopt a decision on anti-satellite weapons tests, a decision unmistakably provocative with regard to the Geneva negotiations? How does Washington motivate its move? Well it claims it has to catch up with the Soviet Union--which is a downright falsehood.

Two years have passed since the Soviet Union pledged unilaterally not to orbit anti-satellite weapons and it has been insisting on considering in Geneva its proposal to ban strike space armaments, including anti-satellite weapons, and scrapping arms of this kind. In the arisen situation, as it

9 October 1985

follows from a statement issued by the Soviet news agency TASS, if the United States tests anti-satellite weapons against a target in space the Soviet Union will consider itself free from the unilateral pledge not to orbit anti-satellite weapons and the responsibility for subsequent events will rest with the American side.

U.S. Sources Cited

LD051439 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 5 Sep 85

[Text] Washington September 5 TASS--The United States is to conduct testing of the anti-satellite (ASAT) system in the current month, according to a statement by the U.S. Department of Defence. The statement said that "the required 15-day waiting period following President Reagan's anti-satellite certification to congress" expired at midnight on Wednesday. "The first test of the U.S. anti-satellite system against an object in space is planned for later this month."

The UPI agency points out in this connection that the announcement followed practically immediately a statement issued by TASS warning that the testing of such weapons would be another step in escalating the arms race and spreading it to outer space.

The Pentagon's decision, which is a challenge to the world public opinion demanding that resolute measures be taken to prevent a militarisation of outer space, has caused a sharply negative reaction in the USA. The testing by the Pentagon of the ASAT system will lead to a new spiral in the arms race, TASS correspondent I. Ignatiev was told by S. Ehrhart, an expert of the American Arms Control Association. The Association, he said, favours a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons systems and supports the USSR's sensible and clear-cut stand as set forth in the TASS statement.

The AVIATION WEEK and SPACE TECHNOLOGY journal recognizes that the USA needs to develop anti-satellite systems to create attack space weapons. Before the end of the current fiscal year the U.S. Air Force is planning to conduct two tests of the weapon. The journal points out that nearly 40 such tests have been conducted so far. Simultaneously the Air Force began creating a technical base for the production of engines for interceptor missiles, sensor devices and control systems, and the use of that equipment in field conditions. The journal stresses that the technology necessary for ASAT and the strategic defence initiative bears undeniable similarity.

Test Conducted

LD132307 Moscow TASS in English 2259 GMT 13 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 14 TASS -- The United States has carried out a test of an anti-satellite (ASAT) weapon against a real target in space. A two-stage rocket was launched from an F-15 fighter plane. Later on, the rocket slammed into the target satellite. So, Washington has made a dangerous step in defiance of widespread protests of the world public, the step which directly leads to the start of deployment of a new class of armaments -- space strike systems. By carrying out the test of an ASAT system, Washington has shown that an escalation of the arms race and the spreading of it over to outer space have been made the corner-stone of U.S. policy.

'Star Wars' Begins

LD141618 Moscow TASS in English 1955 GMT 14 Sep 85

["What Is the USA Driving At?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 14 TASS -- TASS news analyst Yevgeniy Yegorov writes:

On September 13, the United States tested an ASAT system against a target in space. The U.S. Administration thus took a step immediately leading to the beginning of the deployment of dangerous weapons of a new class, attack space systems. Another round of the arms race in space, hinging on the notorious "star wars" program, has begun.

What is noteworthy is that this escalation of war preparations is taking place before the meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva and is called upon, according to admissions of senior U.S. officials, to demonstrate the "resolve" and "firmness" of the Reagan administration.

It should be recollected in this context that in the recent period the Soviet Union had taken a series of concrete steps which could lead to the halting and eventual reversal of the arms race if the United States took similar steps in response.

The Soviet Union, aware of an exceptional important that the complete cessation of the nuclear weapon tests could have for lessening world tension, took another bold step in that direction and imposed a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions from August 6 to January 1, 1986, which will be extended if the United States joins it.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed in his interview to the TIME magazine that the main thing today is to achieve an end to the arms race on earth and to prevent it from spreading into space. Immense importance is attached in this context to the Soviet Union's proposal to discuss at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly the question of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space under condition of its non-militarization.

It should be recalled in view of the U.S. ASAT test that two years ago the Soviet Union unilaterally assumed the obligation not to introduce anti-satellite systems in space. A far-reaching Soviet proposal for a complete ban on attack space weapons, including anti-satellite systems, and for the elimination of such systems has been tabled at the Geneva talks.

What was the response of the U.S. side? The USA responded to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions with another nuclear weapon test and to the Soviet proposals for preventing the spread of the arms race into space with a combat test of anti-satellite weapons.

This is regular practice with the United States. While the Soviet Union introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its new medium-range missiles and on other counter-measures in Europe, the United States intensified the deployment of its first-strike Pershing-2 nuclear missiles in the territories of its West European NATO allies. While the Soviet Union calls for the establishment of a chemical weapon-free zone in central Europe, the United States initiates the production of an advanced and especially barbarous chemical agent, binary gases, and plans to deploy it in Western Europe, primarily in West Germany, where huge stocks of U.S. chemical agents have already been accumulated as it is.

9 October 1985

This list could be continued.

But everything seems clear as it is. Two lines in international relations forcefully manifest themselves. One is a line of removing the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union is unswervingly following it, not out of weakness but out of its resolve to uphold peace at all costs and to save mankind from nuclear catastrophe. The other line is pursued by the United States, which prefers to indulge in pompous rhetoric while spurring on the flywheel of the arms race, which can only plunge the world into an abyss of nuclear war. In short, the divide in today's world politics passes between realism, responsibility and genuine care for the destinies of mankind, displayed by the Soviet Union, and the adventurism of the U.S. militarist forces, pushing the world towards nuclear war.

All this makes one think where the United States is heading. The practical steps taken by it in the recent period naturally hamper constructive preparations for the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons due to resume in Geneva on September 19, and also preparations for the Soviet-U.S. summit.

Acts of militarism perpetrated by the United States can only lead to the further aggravation of international tension and to the deterioration of Soviet-U.S. relations. Clearly, the line of restoring detente and halting and subsequently ending the arms race must prevail for the good of the peoples of the whole world. It is this line that is being pursued by the Soviet Union.

'At Variance' With Assurances

LD142042 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Sep 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by Boris Kalyagin, political observer]

[Text] Hello, comrades. So the United States has taken yet another extremely dangerous step along the path of forcing acceleration of the arms race. What we are talking about is the combat testing of an element of a space-based antimissile defense, the deployment of which is envisaged under the Reagan "star wars" program. It is obvious this action is making preparations for the Soviet-American summit meeting more difficult and it is also hampering the normal working of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments.

The administration's actions have given rise to alarm and protests in America itself. Four members of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, jointly with the influential public organization Union of Concerned Scientists, made an attempt through the courts to prevent the tests. The cancellation of the tests was demanded by 98 American congressmen, who appealed to the U.S. President in a special message.

But, it was all in vain. The White House remained deaf to these calls. The United States smashed the moratorium, that is to say the postponement, on tests of anti-satellite weapons which was declared unilaterally by the Soviet Union.

The present Washington administration is, in general, making a point of rejecting any Soviet peace initiative. To the introduction by our country of a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions, the United States responded by holding a new nuclear test. They rejected our proposal for the creation of a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe. Now we have yet another demonstration of open unwillingness to take a minimal step capable of leading toward arms limitation.

9 October 1985

One cannot fail to note the fact that the Washington administration has been whipping up propaganda hostile to us over the past few days. What's more, the vice president and indeed the President of the United States himself have joined in this campaign. In his latest interview, he tried to depict the Soviet Union as an extremely aggressive country.

Such words, and, what's most important, such deeds on the part of Washington are clearly at variance with the assurances of the White House head that he is willing to make a constructive approach to the Soviet-American summit meeting. The impression is being created that the United States is now deliberately hardening its position, trying, as they say, to score as many points as possible before the forthcoming summit talks and orchestrating matters, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put it figuratively, with the object of transforming them into a clash between political supergladiators who think only about how they can conquer their partners in the most skillful way possible.

Our position is quite different. The Soviet peace initiatives are not a sign of weakness. We are making maximum efforts to bring the process of arms limitation out of the nuclear blind alley into which it has been driven by the policy of the American Administration. The Soviet Union hopes that the White House has not yet given its final word on our peace proposals. We expect from the forthcoming meeting in Geneva real, concrete decisions aimed at ending the arms race and at putting Soviet-American relations onto a normal track. It is precisely for the sake of these objectives that our country intends to take part in the summit meeting.

Compared to First A-Bomb Test

LD150055 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 14 Sep 85

[Commentary attributed to Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Testing of an antisatellite weapon is not merely further action on the United States military program. For significance and consequences it can be compared with the A-bomb test that completed the Manhattan Project in 1945. You will remember the test was followed by the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In the same way the United States' testing of an antisatellite weapon indicates a qualitative leap in the development of new weapons capable of destroying everything on earth. The Soviet Union urges that weapons be kept out of space, but Washington says no, though why it's so insistent about this no is hard to understand.

The military programs in question threaten the United States as much as they do the Soviet Union. Moscow considers it senseless and dangerous to speed up the arms race to a new level. The race is already getting out of control. Deployment of weapons in space would be as great a danger to the United States as to the Soviet Union. Washington's inflexibility on this matter certainly does not help ensure America greater security. The champions of the "star wars" program are only misleading Americans when they claim it amounts to strategic defense and makes nuclear offensive weapons obsolete.

Now, if it really does make nuclear offensive weapons obsolete, why is the United States developing the MX, Trident II, a new generation of cruise missiles, Midgetman and other nuclear weapons?

It is also argued that so far the United States is only researching the problem and there is no stopping progress in science and engineering. Indeed, there is no stopping such progress and no one is trying to stop basic research, but when the research is assigned to companies by a military agency and at a stage that requires mock-ups and field tests it is stretching the point to claim the work is in the research stage. The United States likewise claims there is no way to verify a ban on the militarization of space and hence a ban is pointless. If this were really so, the Soviet Union would never have made its proposals because we have no more reason to trust the United States than the United States has to trust us. We would never agree to measures that could not be effectively controlled. The whole thing is that at this time the actions of the other side can still be reliably controlled with national monitoring facilities.

Not one of the arguments in favor of the "star wars" program stands up to scrutiny and it is unlikely Washington believes them either. What is behind the entire matter is the eagerness of the U.S. munitions corporations to make fabulous profits on Defense Department contracts at the expense of the American taxpayer. If America's leaders do develop antisatellite weapons the Soviet Union will consider itself free of its unilateral commitment to keep antisatellite facilities out of space. More than that. As the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev told TIME magazine, if there is no ban on the militarization of space, if nothing is done to prevent an arms race in space there will be nothing at all. This is the firm position of the Soviet Union, based on a most exacting analysis that takes into account both the interests of the Soviet Union and the interests of the United States.

Impact on Bilateral Ties

LD151454 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Sep 85

[Text] The United States has conducted a test of its new anti-satellite weapon against an object in space. Our observer, Igor Petrov, makes this comment:

On the eve of the test, district Court Judge in Washington, D. C., Norma Johnson, denied a request by four members of Congress and an organization of scientists to forbid it. Norma Johnson said the issue was a political question between the legislative and executive branches of government in which the court should not intervene. True, the issue was 100 percent political but not only between the two branches of the United States Government. Building and testing anti-satellite weapons is a major issue between those who seek to turn outer space into another area of military competition and those who warn that such a reckless policy is likely to do irreparable harm to arms control.

When an F-15 fighter fired a two stage rocket against the out-of-use Solwind satellite, it was not only a test of a new generation of ASAT weapons; with minor adjustments the current American technology can be used against missiles and therefore, as many experts have said, the task can be viewed as a first step towards making Star Wars a reality. The Reagan administration is faced with strong opposition to extending the arms race into space. As some observers have pointed out, given the strong opposition to the SDI in the United States and abroad, the White House may try to come in through the back

rather than marching through the front door with Star Wars by testing its various components separately under the guise of other military or civilian programs that would be described as unrelated to Star Wars.

The Friday test of an ASAT weapon was political. Reports from Washington said that it was authorized by the White House, not Air Force commanders. Therefore the decision was understood as a signal to Moscow that despite its 2 year old moratorium on launching anti-satellite weapons and persistent calls to ban new anti-satellite arms and destroy existing systems, Washington was determined to go ahead. What's more it was a signal that such Soviet initiatives as a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts, moves to ban chemical arms, a pledge never to be the first to use nuclear arms and others, are rejected and that Moscow's unilateral restraint is of no value to the White House.

The Soviet Union was warned that the militarization of outer space would unleash an uncontrollable round of competition in all kinds of weapons, offensive ones included. The Soviet Union has said that an American test would make it free from its 2 years old commitment not to launch its own weapons. All this has also been ignored. Much has been said in Washington about the need to work out an agenda not only for the November summit meeting, but for many years to come. Was the Friday test of the American anti-satellite weapon a hint as to what awaits Soviet-American relations in the foreseeable future?

Cosmonauts Speak Out

LD152035 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 15 Sep 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, on 13 September tests were carried out in the United States of the ASAT system. A step was taken in the development of a new class of dangerous weapons, strike space weapons. Here is the opinion of Soviet cosmonauts about this. The recording was made during a routine television communications session with the orbiting Salyut-Soyuz complex.

[Begin recording] [Dzhanibekov] Obviously only people who have worked in space and on earth, and those who have, well, something, even if it is inside, [word indistinct] with life at all, with life, life on earth, ordinary life, those who think about themselves, who think about children, [word indistinct] the future, that is, a normal, physiologically normal grown-up person, with his head on his shoulders, he cannot fail to tremble when he thinks about where they are trying to drag us to [paragraph as heard]

[Grechko] We all understand that it is very dangerous to begin the militarization of space. It is dangerous because it is hard to monitor, dangerous because new types of weapons are being created--beam weapons, laser weapons--dangerous because the weapons are coming closer now not only to countries, but closer to every town, to every person. If, let's say, the time from

continent to continent for an inter-continental missile used to be 30 minutes, then the average (?radius) of action was 6 minutes, now it is overhead. This is a very dangerous process.

[Leonov] We have done a lot. From small cottages we have gone on to creating such big buildings as the orbital station in which you are now flying. But we are thinking of going further. We are thinking of large settlements in space. This is a dream. We shall create it, but so far we have not created it.

[Strekalov] Space up to now has remained the sole sphere of human activity where up to now there have not been weapons. And this sad report, is perhaps one of the steps, toward a general catastrophe.

[Beregovoy] So only by uniting the efforts of all peaceloving peoples, it is necessary to fight for peace before it is too late.

[Dzhanibekov] We pronounce a decisive protest against such steps by the Reagan administration. We are indignant to the depths of our souls. [words indistinct] to Star Wars is completely absurd. It is the most direct way to suicide. [end recording]

[video shows Dzhanibekov in the spacecraft, floating next to Savinykh; the other cosmonauts are sitting next to each other on a bench and speaking to [the] camera]

Linked to Space Command

PM161453 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Melor Sturua "Publicists' comments": "What Their Target Is"]

[Text] Two events took place in the United States 13 September that really makes one believe that the number 13 is unlucky.

Event No 1. The Pentagon officially declared that the new U.S. space command, with headquarters in Colorado Springs, was going into operation. The "star wars" program has thus been provided with its staff.

Event No 2. The ASAT anti-satellite system was tested. An F-15 fighter launched a two-stage missile whose homing device hit an obsolete military intelligence satellite designated "Solwind".

But the shot fired from the F-15 jet fighter which took off 13 September was aimed not just or even primarily at the defunct "Solwind" satellite. The shot fired last Friday was aimed at the cause of peace. A step was taken toward deploying a new class of dangerous arms--space strike means. A shot was fired at the nonmilitarization of outer space and the ABM treaty, since, under the guise of testing the ASAT system the development is beginning of anti-missile means in air-launched and other basing modes. A shot was fired in the "star wars"--the ASAT system is directly linked with Washington's

9 October 1985

so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." The coincidence of the two events--the coming into operation of the new U.S. space command and operation "Solwind"--symbolically stresses their ominous kinship.

It is claimed that 13 September was not specially chosen for the ASAT tests but was "calculated" on the basis that that was the day when the target satellite was in a suitable position for the test. It is possible that from a purely technical standpoint that is how it was. But what is much more important than the technical calculation behind this act was the political one. It was timed to coincide with yet another event, the opening of the third round of the Geneva talks, and in the longer term the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting.

The Soviet Union has recently taken a whole series of important initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race, of which the moratorium on nuclear tests is an example. How, though, does Washington respond to this? Contrary to the Soviet Union, it is more and more persistently working toward aggravating the international situation by not only failing to clear a way for success at the Geneva talks and for preparation for the summit but by deliberately putting obstacles in their way.

The Soviet Union's line is one of strengthening peace. Washington's line is one of increasing tension.

On 13 September Washington shot itself. That is not just our opinion. This is what Admiral Geyler wrote in an article entitled "The Boomerang Effect of Reagan's ASAT System": "We are shooting ourselves, and not in the foot, but much closer to the head.... This vicious circle guarantees an endless escalation of the arms race."

Our planet is not an obsolete "Solwind" satellite. Those people who have their sights set on it are criminally and irresponsibly playing with mankind's destiny.

Destruction of Existing Systems Proposed

PM161336 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Sep 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain Second Rank Ye. Nikitin article: "Criminal Step"]

[Text] The U.S. Administration has taken yet another criminal step along the road of complicating the international situation. Without heeding the consequences it has tested the ASAT antisatellite system against a real target in space. Contrary to common sense and despite the fact that the Soviet Union's commitment not to put antisatellite weapons into space has been in force for 2 years now, Washington is cranking up a new spiral of the arms race. Moreover, it is transferring it to space.

Washington's new aggressive act, which is being called a "great step forward" overseas, should be seen in the context of the overall adventurist efforts aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. Antisatellite weapons are, in fact, one of the elements in the systems created in the United States and intended, according to

the White House schemes, to inflict a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union. "For the United States the creation of antisatellite systems would be senseless if it were not planned to carry out a first strike and start a nuclear war," U.S. military specialist I. (Keras) stated.

The testing of antisatellite weapons, one of the components of the "star wars" program, is causing alarm, including in the United States itself. "It shows shortsightedness. It is a mistake. Ultimately there can be no winners in a space arms race," THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER summed up in connection with the U.S. antisatellite weapon test. "The White House is not aiming to conclude a mutual and verifiable agreement with the USSR which would establish the strictest limitations on antisatellite weapons," Senator J. Kerry opines.

To counter the U.S. course aimed at exacerbating the situation, the Soviet Union is proposing the destruction of all antisatellite means already held by the United States and the USSR, including those on which testing has not been completed. This would create favorable conditions for improving the international situation, restraining the arms race, and preventing it spreading to space.

TASS Cites L'HUMANITE

LD161623 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Text] Paris September 16 TASS—"Has a 'Star War' begun? At least, the launching of an experimental rocket by the U.S. Air Force undoubtedly suggests this idea," Yves Moreau, political news analyst of L'HUMANITE writes today in an article headlined "UN Coup de Folie" (An Act of Folly). The author recalls that the question of the subject and objectives of the then forthcoming Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms was considered in January this year during the talks in Geneva between the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR and the U.S. secretary of state. It was agreed that the objective of the talks would be to work out effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and at ending the arms race on earth.

However, L'HUMANITE points out, nothing has changed since then: the preparation being made by Ronald Reagan for "Star Wars" is going on. The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva have made no headway because the United States refuses to pursue a policy of non-militarization of outer space. At the same time, the newspaper emphasizes, Moscow continues to abide by the obligation, which it assumed unilaterally in 1983, not to resort to anti-satellite weapons.

The experimental rocket launched by the Pentagon has reached its target. But did not it thereby deliver a blow on hopes for achieving international detente and agreement?

L'HUMANITE queries. Is not that a signal for a new spiral in the arms race the scope of which and the related risk defy any estimates.

Meanwhile outer space, free from any kind of weapons, is an unlimited field for the development of universal peaceful cooperation, Yves Moreau writes in conclusion.

Violates ABM Treaty

OW161415 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 16 Sep 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Edward Mnatsakanov]

[Text] As you know, the other day the Pentagon carried out a test of its anti-satellite weapon--a space strike weapon--whose creation [sozdaniye] is prohibited by the Soviet-American ABM treaty. It also became known that the United States intends to further shoot down artificial earth satellites for test purposes.

This was stated by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger. It is extremely important, he said, that we continue work to realize our program, that is, the Star Wars program. Besides all this, the clearly provocative nature of anti-missile weapons tests is confirmed by the fact that the Americans are designing the target missiles that are being created [sozdavayemye] for these tests on the pattern and likeness of Soviet artificial earth satellites.

Washington is stopping at nothing. Appearing on a program of the CBS Television Company, the same Weinberger declared that the Reagan Administration does not at all intend to discuss the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative [SDI] with anyone. This is the White House position on the talks on nuclear and space arms, which resume soon in Geneva, and on the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting.

How does one explain all this? According to the astonishing logic of the American administration, precisely the feverish buildup of American nuclear missile weapons and space militarization are intended to facilitate success at the talks with the Soviet Union. Thus, the arms race must facilitate its own cessation.

The other day Adelman, one of the prominent figures of the Washington administration, spoke in the same vein. This person explained his affected optimism in this way: We Americans are developing our nuclear muscle. Therefore, the Soviet Union will move toward concluding an agreement on arms reduction, whether it wants to or not.

This, of course, is gibberish, but the Mr Adelmans see the path of adopting mutually acceptable agreements on arms limitation and reduction precisely in this way. However, Adelman, as well as President Reagan himself and other high-ranking representatives of the Washington administration, have another argument--if one can call it that--in favor of continuing the arms race. White House Press Secretary Speakes formulated the argument this way. In this case the question was about the military development [osvoyeniye] of space. In this respect, he said, the Russians are far ahead. Therefore, every effort must be made to catch up with the Soviet Union.

Such talk is also not new. However, here American deception is particularly striking. After all, the whole world knows that the Soviet Union has for more than 2 years unilaterally taken upon itself the obligation of not putting its antisatellite weapons into space. How could it come out ahead?

Something else is also interesting. The United States has almost completely curtailed economic and scientific and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union. As you know, it is applying enormous pressure on its allies, requiring that they do the same. All this is in order not to--God forbid--transfer by chance the advanced technology of the West to the backward--as they say--Soviet Union, and thereby not to facilitate the economic and scientific and technical progress of the USSR, and the growth of its defense capability. Thus, on one hand, Washington is trying to convince the rest of the world that the Soviet Union is an extremely backward country in scientific, technical, and technological areas, and let it remain so. On the other hand, Washington assures that the Soviet Union is ahead in everything, particularly in its military developments [razrabotki], and that it must be caught up with.

As you see, the two ends clearly do not meet. In both these cases Washington is clearly lying.

International Criticism

LD161816 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 16 Sep 85

[From "International Diary" program presented by Igor Charikov]

[Excerpts] Reports continue coming in from many countries about sharp criticism of the testing of an anti-satellite weapon carried out by the United States. Over to our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

If one were to try to reduce to a common denominator the commentaries of the world press on this question, I should probably point to what was said by the TIMES OF INDIA, where it is noted that the carrying out of the American test has caused alarm in the world public. The leading Indian newspaper names two reasons for this alarm: The danger of a new spiral in the arms race, and the cloud that has been cast over the prospects for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. Indeed, the testing of the American SAT anti-satellite system is an attempt to spread the arms race to space. I remind you that before that, for 2 years there operated a unilateral undertaking by the USSR not to put anti-satellite weaponry into space. Washington, instead of joining this moratorium, decided to act regardless of consequences. But after all, this is a near-sighted and dangerous policy.

Criticism aimed at Washington was specially intensified in connection with the forthcoming resumption this week of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons. Things have got to such a pitch, that even the leader of the American delegation, Kampelman, has sounded the alarm. The Russians, he declares, are putting forward new ideas, while the United States is rejecting them. The impression is being created that the Russians are supposedly displaying more flexibility than the Americans. Yes, indeed, truth is truth. On the eve of the Geneva meetings the USSR has to its credit both the unilateral halt on nuclear explosions, specific proposals on reducing nuclear weapons, and a whole program of international cooperation in the peaceful mastery of space. What can the United States boast about? New nuclear explosions in Nevada and the destruction by a missile of one of its own satellites. So can one be surprised at the increasingly resolute condemnation by the world public of the adventurist course of Washington?

Gorbachev: ASAT Freeze 'Null, Void'

OW171155 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 17 Sep 85

[Text] According to NHK Correspondent Yamada in Moscow, Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev, at a meeting with JSP Chairman Ishibashi yesterday, reportedly said that the freeze on ASAT, satellite attack weapons, declared by the Soviet Union 2 years ago, had become null and void [nakimononi natta]. This was revealed today by a person accompanying Chairman Ishibashi.

According to the person, at the meeting General Secretary Gorbachev, after bitterly criticizing the ASAT test carried out by the United States on 14 September, reportedly said: In the interest of nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union declared a freeze on the deployment of satellite attack weapons 2 years ago. However, because of the latest action by the United States, this has become null and void.

Regarding the U.S. ASAT test, the Soviet Union had warned -- in the form of a statement issued by the state-run TASS news agency -- that, if the test should be carried out, the Soviet Union would be free to lift the freeze on deployment. However, this is the first time that General Secretary Gorbachev had explicitly stated himself that the freeze declaration had become null and void.

It is not clear if this statement means that the Soviet Union will immediately resume deployment or not. However, the aforementioned person regards it as a bargaining tactic for the Geneva U.S.-Soviet arms reduction negotiations, scheduled to resume on 19 September, and/or the U.S.-Soviet summit talks slated for November.

Victory for Hawks, Defence Firms

LD210939 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 20 Sep 85

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, foreign political affairs commentator, with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; Yuriy Baranov, correspondent in Managua; Yevgeniy Kachanov, commentator; Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio commentator; and Yevgeniy Lukyanov, correspondent in Algiers]

[Excerpts] [Lavrentyev] Why does Washington cling so stubbornly to its military programs, particularly to the ASAT system? Asks Comrade Golovanov, from Leningrad. I put this question, and a number of others, to Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer.

[Shishlin] September 13th this year turned out to be an overcast day for Soviet-American relations. This was the day of the test of the U.S. antisatellite system, ASAT.

First of all, I should like to say what this is, from the technical standpoint: The ASAT system consists of a miniature, nonnuclear, homing warhead, located on a 2-stage, short-range strike missile, which the Americans call Altair. It is launched in the air from a specially-equipped F-15 aircraft, and can hit satellites flying in low orbit. The Americans are planning to conduct another test in 1985, and then they want to deploy the system at two air bases, one on each coast of the United States. I repeat that all this is the technical side of the matter. In essence, however, the

test of an antisatellite system by the Americans is an event of a pronounced political nature. It is yet another signal, yet another demonstration of the hardline, uncompromising policy of the present American Administration of the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

This is, in essence, a victory for hawks in official Washington, and a defeat for reason. In particular, Weinberger, the U.S. Defense Secretary, asserts that the successful test by the Americans of an antisatellite weapon is a great step forward. But one wants to ask, Where does this step lead? Forward in which direction? It seems to me that th's forward is not along the road to peace, not along the road to guaranteeing a sound international security. In essence, the fact is that the United States is setting in train on a broad front work to implement its Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI].

What is the political significance of these actions? Of course, the aim is the same as before: to endeavor to break through to military superiority over the Soviet Union. Here official U.S. figures swear that they are adhering faithfully to the treaty, but in fact their very actions breach the 1972 treaty on antimissile defense. In particular, the U.S. President quite recently spoke of the U.S attitude toward Soviet demands not to permit the militarization of space and to end the arms race on earth. He said this: As I have already said, we shall discuss space weapons in Geneva. We have, he asserts, no ASAT system to negotiate about. Naturally, this must be understood as meaning that the United States does not want to talk about ASAT weapons. The President further declared that he would naturally discuss any issues, but the SDI is not a bargaining chip; SDI is not something we intend to renounce as a result of negotiations.

As you can see, this is a totally destructive stance, a harsh position, not a flexible one. Of course, as a result of these ASAT weapon tests which the United States is conducting, the situation is deteriorating, and not only in Soviet-American relations: A dark shadow is cast over international relations as a whole.

I would like to add to this that now the USSR, is naturally released from the unilateral moratorium, which it introduced in August 1983 on testing of antisatellite weapons, and naturally the USSR will draw the appropriate conclusions from the U.S. actions. We may say quite definitely that, despite all the dangers of the plans, designs, and practical actions of the United States, their overall aim of breaking through to military superiority was and remains unattainable.

Will the United States be capable of learning the political lessons of the situation which has arisen? Of course, we will receive an answer to this only in a few weeks time, once the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has taken place.

[Lavrentyev] Nikolay Vladimirovich, our listener Andrey Nikanorovich Tyukalov from Minsk is interested in the American military-industrial complex. He asks us to name the concerns which derive the greatest benefit from the Pentagon's military programs and to say who in the Reagan administration champions their interests most energetically.

[Shishlin] Well, this is by and large a fairly well-known matter, and our newspapers and magazines are quite generous in the amount of material they published on the subject. It is of course a matter of topical importance. First, what is the military-industrial complex? The military-industrial complex is a close-knit collection of the military-industrial monopolies, military circles, and the state bureaucracy. The American military-industrial complex was shaped during the years of the cold war, and none other than President Eisenhower of the United States said back in January 1961 that this amalgamation of the colossal military apparatus and large-

scale military industry was something new in the history of America, and Eisenhower warned of the potentialities for the ruinous growth of this illegal authority, as he called it, for the desitny of the country itself.

Well, it must regrettably be noted today that the U.S. military-industrial complex is a reality and its enormous influence on the country's international and domestic policies is a reality; the reality is that the American military-industrial complex exercises an influence on the present tense international situation to a gigantic extent in its desire to maintain a high level of confrontation between the two systems. The following figures could be used to illustrate the real extent of the American military-industrial complex. For instance, the Pentagon currently concludes more than 200,000 contracts annually with 120,000 suppliers and contractors. In the total number of primary orders, 100 companies receive roughly 70 percent of all Pentagon orders. Such firms, for instance, as General Dynamics, Rockwell International, Lockheed and Northrop, a mere four firms, have 23 percent of all Pentagon orders. In the past 20 years, three military-industrial concerns -- General Dynamics and Lockheed, which I have already mentioned, and McDonnell Douglas -- received orders worth a total of \$108.8 billion.

What do they produce? They produce cruise missiles; they produce the F-16 fighters, M1 tanks, Trident submarines, and ballistic missiles for various classes of submarines. A characteristic feature in the reciprocal links between military and industrial circles is that there is a constant toing-and-froing by people from the Pentagon to the corporations and from the corporations to the military department. Since the listener is interested in who in the American Administration reflects to the greatest extent the point of view of the military-industrial complex, one has to admit that it is both simple and difficult to reply to this question. The whole of the present American Administration is in essence enormously influenced by the military-industrial complex. These are Californians, and California is the main smithy where American weapons are forged.

Of course the military-industrial complex means of political influence are simply gigantic. In the past 30 years the American military-industrial complex has sold weapons worth over 110 billion dollars abroad. In the numerous wars which have taken place during the 4 decades since the war in different corners of the world, American weapons have not been silent. They have been killing people.

But the question arises, all the same, why the American economy is so committed to the military industry. The relation in terms of pure profit between capital spent in civilian industries and military industries in the United States appears as follows: The profits of the military corporations are 70 percent higher than those of corporations involved in producing civilian goods. The military-industrial complex is indeed the originator and true architect of the "star wars" plans which threaten to destabilize the world situation and to open up an arms race along all axes, in all directions.

[Lavrentyev] A final question for you, Nikolay Vladimirovich. What is the attitude of the United States' NATO partners in Europe to the ASAT system? This question was sent in by Viktor Mikhaylovich Gorelov from Moscow.

[Shishlin] As far as the attitudes of the American partners and allies toward this test are concerned, it must be said that altogether they are not saying very much. But there are reactions of a different nature, and they are quite natural. The American allies quite naturally associated the testing of antisatellite weapons with the intentions regarding the militarization of space which are being proclaimed openly by the present American Administration. It seems that on this point there are quite

9 October 1985

a number of U.S. allies who have doubts as to whether these actions are justified. I would even go so far as to say that, essentially, as far as this "star wars" program and, correspondingly, the creation of antisatellite weapons on the part of the Americans are concerned, the picture is roughly as follows: The American standpoint is shared if not 100 percent, then at least almost 100 percent, by the British Government and the West German authorities. All the other allies are speaking out against these American plans, albeit to differing degrees. Moreover, they are speaking out in quite definite terms. Mulroney, the Canadian prime minister, has officially declared that Canada does not wish to take part in these plans for the militarization of space at the government level. A visit was recently paid to the United States by Schlueter, the Danish prime minister. He also declared that Denmark would not be taking part in this SDI. Quite recently the French prime minister responded in a highly critical fashion to these U.S. actions to militarize space.

But it must be said that the Western Governments themselves do not object to their firms cooperating on a private basis with the U.S. organizers of this "star wars" program. These firms are attracted by two things: First, big money, that is, the chance of getting contracts. On the other hand, of course, the chance of gaining access to modern technology of one sort or another, although on the second point of course there are many more doubts than certainties that the modern technology will fall into the hands of the Western Europeans.

The Soviet Union is naturally having to make serious political efforts to open the eyes of the world to the full danger of the military work being done by the United States. And, on the other hand, it is seeking to adopt practical measures to ensure that the present military-strategic parity remains unshakeable. And this is being done.

Functioning Satellite Destroyed

LD232256 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 23 Sep 85

[Excerpts] The United States Defense Department was intentionally deceiving the public when it announced that the space system ASAT would be tested on 13 September on an allegedly nonfunctioning satellite, Solwind. Viktor Olin comments on the exposure.

Many American scientists using satellites for space exploration have expressed indignation with the machinations of the Defense Department. Robert McQueen, director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado, has said the information reported by Solwind had great scientific value. The destruction of the satellite, according to Professor McQueen, was the result of a deplorable decision. I can't tell you why it was picked for destruction, he said. It's a puzzle to me.

The circumstances of the 13 September testing of an antisatellite weapon in the United States can give an answer to this and other bewildering questions. The testing was marked by extreme haste, prompted primarily by political considerations. The administration wanted to give another sign to the Soviet Union of its intentions to continue preparations for "star wars" and at the same time avoid a conflict with Congress, just resuming work after the summer recess. Besides, the military needed an object in space capable of sending telemetric information. Only an end in the flow of such information after the launching of the antisatellite missile could show that the target was hit. An admission to this end was made by a spokesman for the Pentagon, Robert Sims, who justified the destruction of an operating satellite by the fact that it was expected to stop functioning any moment. However, he didn't explain why Defense

Secretary Caspar Weinberger on the eve of the testing publicly declared Solwind a burned-out satellite. It is possible that in this way the head of the Defense Department tried to distract the attention of scientific and public circles from the continuing subordination of United States space programs to the plans of militarizing terrestrial space. The shuttle program can serve as an example.

There are also many other signs showing that the military intend to play a decisive role in outlining the United States space policy. This is proved by the uncerecermonious way in which scientists were deceived and an operating satellite was unhesitatingly destroyed.

CSO: 5200/1008

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. SALT NEGOTIATORS SAY U.S. STANCE HAMPERS ARMS CONTROL

LD141144 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 14 Sep 85

[Text.] Washington, 14 Sep (TASS)--The forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting should be used for working out concrete accords in the field of arms limitation, the two chief U.S. negotiators of the SALT I and II arms control agreements, have told a press conference here.

Gerard Smith and Paul Warnke, denouncing the attempts by some U.S. officials to belittle the significance of the meeting, stressed that there was "now an opportunity ... for a major breakthrough."

Warnke pointed out in this connection that an important step in this direction would be made by the United States abandoning the testing and deployment of "star wars" systems. He highly assessed constructive proposals advanced by general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

Smith and Warnke pointed out that the American Administration's tough stand hampers reaching a compromise and does not contribute to progress in arms control.

A statement, signed by prominent American politicians, including former secretary of state Cyrus Vance and former Central Intelligence Agency director William Colby, as well as representatives of major public organizations of the United States, was distributed at the press conference.

They appealed to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union to reaffirm their adherence to the existing treaties on the limitation of strategic armaments and the antiballistic missile treaty. They also called for a reciprocal moratorium on testing anti-satellite weapons and for a halt of nuclear tests.

The statement stresses that achieving an accord on one or several points would make an important contribution toward lessening risk of nuclear war and reducing tensions in relations between the USSR and the United States.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ANALYST SEES U.S. 'ANTI-SOVIET' MOVES BEFORE SUMMIT

LD251907 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 25 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The less time till the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva the more effective the movement of the U.S. public to ensure that the meeting produces tangible results, such as accords on ending the arms race, preventing the militarisation of space, lowering the levels of nuclear confrontation and improving U.S.-Soviet relations. This was pointed out recently by notable figures of previous administrations and by many well-known scientists and experts. Many senators and house members strongly criticise the White House's position on the militarisation of space. The Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at curbing the arms race have evoked a broad positive response all over the world.

What Washington displays is only what TIMES of London characterises as stubborn intransigence. However, it would be perhaps more to the point to characterise all the actions and statements of the administration as well as well-orchestrated anti-Soviet campaign aimed to detract from the influence of Soviet peace policy on the Americans and their allies and to put in advance outside the framework of the talks and dialogue with the USSR those questions which Washington would like to circumvent.

The orchestrators and soloists of the anti-Soviet campaign in a "new arrangement" are primarily White House and Pentagon officials. Taking cover behind demagogical claims that U.S. plans to militarise space will bring mankind riddance of nuclear weapons, senior White House officials are trying to prove to the U.S. mass media that their military space programmes are inviolable.

In so doing, they quote the U.S. President as saying that his Strategic Defence Initiative -- the "star wars" programme -- cannot be a trade-off in the talks.

The President's national security adviser, Robert McFarlane, speaking on U.S. television, for instance, categorically rejected any possible restrictions on the "star wars" programme. It clearly followed from his address that the United States considered the development and testing of attack space weapons to be "a legitimate part" of research. Proceeding from this obviously fallacious assumption, White House officials stepped up their attacks on the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limitation of anti-missile defense systems which prohibits, both in the letter and in the spirit, the development, testing and deployment of these armaments.

Robert McFarlane also groundlessly claims that the USSR has itself subverted that treaty not only by "violating" its stipulations but also by building up the Soviet

strategic nuclear forces over the years. This ploy is nothing new. It is used by the United States whenever it begins a new round of the arms race. It is usual with the U.S. Administration to claim a U.S. "lag" and, having made the "scared" Congress part with huge appropriations, to make another spurt in the arms race and to build unprecedentedly the military muscle in an attempt to tip strategic parity.

U.S. Administration officials also deceive the world public when they talk about some new proposals of the USA at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. Even the number of these proposals has been mentioned by the President. But McFarlane has had to admit that none of the U.S. delegates to Geneva has so far presented any proposal at the talks since they still are "in the minds of high-ranking cabinet members." We have to say anew that the American side has not done anything to break the deadlock at the talks. Not a single practical and constructive proposal has come from it. The U.S. position is ossified, unconstructive and negative, and is based on old ideas which have long proved unsuitable as a basis for mutually acceptable accords.

One gets the impression that the United States continues to consider its main task to be not a search for mutually acceptable solutions in the three areas of the Geneva talks but the tightening of the deadlock at those talks.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger is playing a special role here. To all appearances, he is altogether against the talks since they "do not fit" into the Pentagon's plans.

Today, too, he is named in the USA as one of the main initiators and orchestrators of hostile campaigns. According to the U.S. press, the military-industrial complex helped by Weinberger is trying hard to subvert the preparations for the forthcoming summit and to prevent it from producing results. The Pentagon chief has even called off his tour of Asian countries planned for October to accomplish that task.

It is also said that precisely Weinberger arranged it so that the United States tested anti-satellite weapons against a space target before the summit, just to thwart on the eve of that major event the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on the introduction of anti-satellite weapons in space.

Orchestrating the anti-Soviet campaign, the Pentagon chief is also "signing" its "scores." How can one view, for example, his report "Soviet Acquisition of Militarily Significant Western Technology: An Update"? This "report" is replete with absurd allegations that the Soviet Union is developing its military technology by stealing American know-how. The defense secretary is not at all taken aback by obvious controversies of these "arguments." Indeed, trying to justify higher military appropriations, they claim the Soviet Union's fantastic surge ahead in the field of technology while when they try to rationalise all sorts of restrictions and quotas, they portray the Soviet Union as a hidebound backward village. So the Pentagon's chief obviously cannot make ends meet.

Hostility towards the Soviet Union and its policy is being whipped up by the U.S. reactionary right-wing forces, which would like to complicate by virulent propaganda the summit and to whip up tensions. The Soviet Union's far-reaching proposals have a positive effect on world public opinion and those forces would like that demagoguery about "non-nuclear future" to conceal the escalation of the arms race in the USA. They are also trying with this purpose to distort the Soviet Union's peace initiatives and its vigorous attempts to find solutions to the problem of non-militarisation of space with simultaneous sizeable reductions in the nuclear arms arsenals of both sides.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET INITIATIVES CONTRASTED WITH U.S. PROPAGANDA

LD152141 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 Sep 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The following situation has become more precisely plotted in the international arena this week: On the one hand there is the dynamic, constructive, the--I would say--forceful [nastupatel'naya] foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is opening up real opportunities to lessen international tension; on the other hand there is the dangerous policy of the United States which is leading to an intensification of the arms race and the threat of war, and to a deterioration in Soviet-American relations. In this can be seen certain behavioral laws: For example, the more there are of our new constructive proposals, the more the commotion on the Potomac--from where comes immediately a negative answer. The question "Why?" is asked. It is not difficult to answer.

In the first place the current U.S. Administration, to judge by it all, is concerned merely with perorating in favor of peace, but is hardly interested in concrete affairs. The United States' military-industrial complex keeps a careful watch so that there will not even be a hint of a real reduction in the number of military orders and a cut in the Pentagon's budget. For it is a matter of billions of dollars.

In the second place the United States' right-wing circles and the boss of the White House himself are afraid that the Soviet peace initiatives will destroy the myth of Washington itself, that the Soviet Union is today, so they say, the source of all danger in general.

That is why these circles are now unleashing an actual campaign of hatred against the Soviet Union. All our proposals are declared to be propaganda.

Well, all right. If this is propaganda, then why does not Washington reply with propaganda threefold more, as they say? They could adopt and announce their own moratorium, let us say, on all nuclear explosions, or adopt a pledge not to use nuclear weapons first. No, they don't want to. They are busy with something else there--this is primarily the concrete implementation of dangerous plans for the militarization of space.

In the face of public opinion throughout the whole world, and within the United States itself, of many legislators who inhabit Capital Hill--in particular, 98 members of the U.S. House of Representatives who appealed specially to President Reagan in recent days--despite all this, on 13 September the testing was conducted of the ASAT system. This is a clear attempt to torpedo the moratorium, a provocative step which gives the green light to the arms race in space. Numerous reports now arrive from the teletypes of protests and the condemnation of this action of Washington's.

The position of the Soviet Union appears in sharp contrast to the United States' position. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in a conversation with Johannes Rau, emphasized once again in recent days, the USSR is decisively against the spread of the arms race into space and against the preparations for Star Wars. We have offered the international community another future: broad cooperation in the peaceful investigation and use of space.

What not everybody in the United States can yet understand is already becoming the norm of public consciousness in other countries. Just a few days ago Canada became the sixth country to reject plans to participate in the preparations for Star Wars. Although it must be said that Ottawa is attempting to maneuver and a loophole--and quite a big one at that--has been left open for the private sector. But the fact itself of a refusal at the state level shows that the governments of the NATO states now cannot leave out of account the mood of the peoples who are against the star wars plans and try to keep as far away as possible from these plans.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. 'MISLEADING PUBLIC OPINION' ON ABM TREATY

LD241648 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 24 Sep 85

["Another Propaganda Trick by Washington"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 24 TASS -- By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev

Lately, Reagan administration officials have been perseveringly trying to convince the public of the "need" of making changes in the 1972 Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.

As a matter of fact, changes already were introduced in the ABM Treaty in 1974, and at that time they were regarded in the world as an important step along the lines of enhancing international stability. The protocol to ABM Treaty, signed in Moscow in 1974, provided, among other things, for the reduction of the areas of deployment of ABM systems from two, as stipulated by the 1972 agreement, to one for each of the sides. Accordingly, the number of ABM launchers and interceptor missiles of the USSR and the United States was halved from 200 to 100.

However, recent pronouncements by administration officials concerning changes in the ABM Treaty did not deal with the further strengthening of the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. agreement of 1972 which sets limits on the anti-ballistic missile systems of both sides. "New changes," in the opinion of Reagan administration officials, should lead to a complete revision of that document of paramount importance, to "legalize" the militarization of outer space and to give a semblance of legality to U.S. plans for the deployment of a destabilizing space-based anti-ballistic missile defense.

In a bid to "retouch" its obviously aggressive plans for this deployment of anti-ballistic missile weapons in space, Washington does not stop at outright deception. According to the American television company CBS, a high-ranking official of the Reagan administration who preferred not to be identified in the press, alleged that the Soviet Union, just as the United States, thought it was possible to renounce the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, because, according to him, it has become obsolete.

The Soviet Union has stressed more than once that the ABM Treaty is a barrier in the way to the race in strategic arms. The USSR favored and favors the strict unswerving observance of that agreement and believes that it is inadmissible to work toward its erosion, let alone, to call into question the prospect of its existence.

The statement of the high-ranking official of the Reagan administration is a very awkward attempt at misleading public opinion, shifting on the Soviet Union at least a portion of the responsibility for the present aggravation of international relations and dampening the intensity of criticism levelled at the United States which is following the course toward undermining the existing accords, toward a relentless buildup of nuclear and space arms.

9 October 1985

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS HITS WEINBERGER SDI COMMENTS IN CBS INTERVIEW

LD161413 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0919 GMT 16 Sep 85

[Excerpt] Washington, 16 Sep (TASS)--The U.S. Administration does not intend to abandon its dangerous plans for spreading the arms race into space, and will oppose all efforts aimed at averting the militarization of near-earth space. This has been confirmed by U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, who stressed in an interview with the CBS television network that the United States will not discuss President Reagan's 'Strategic Defense Initiative' at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons at Geneva. As is known, this 'initiative' has nothing to do with defense and is aimed at creating and deploying a large-scale antimissile defense system with elements based in space, within the framework of the U.S. nuclear first-strike potential.

It is extremely important that work on the implementation of the SDI should continue, Weinberger declared. He cried to make out that the ABM system, which is being developed in violation of the treaty commitments taken upon itself by the United States, would allow nuclear weapons to be 'liquidated.'

In speeding up the work on the development and deployment of the latest space strike armaments, the United States intends to carry out a whole series of tests of antisatellite systems. As Lieutenant General B. Randolph, deputy head of the U.S. Air Force research program, has confirmed, the next test of antisatellite weaponry will be carried out "during the next few months." The first test on a real target in space, during which a two-stage missile fired from an F-15 fighter hit a target satellite, was carried out on 13 September. According to UPI, the Pentagon, intends to deploy a working "ASAT" antisatellite system by 1987.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ON MCFARLANE CBS INTERVIEW ON CONTINUING SDI

LD231634 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 23 Sep 85

[Text] New York, September 23 TASS — The U.S. Administration will not make any concessions to the USSR in the field of the "Strategic Defense Initiative", according to Robert McFarlane, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs. Speaking in an interview to the ABC television company, McFarlane maintained, contrary to all logic, that both sides "can gain by the integration of non-nuclear defense (that is how he chose to describe space strike systems which are to be incorporated into an ABM defense — TASS) in our forces and getting rid of nuclear weapons."

Asked whether the White House was committed to the policy whereby the administration was prepared to violate the 1972 ABM treaty in order to carry out tests within the framework of President Reagan's "initiative", the assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs answered vaguely that he did not assert that there wasn't "some margin in the future for examining" that treaty. At the same time McFarlane tried to justify the Pentagon's preparations for the development of space weapons by standard statements concerning the "Soviet threat" and "Soviet military superiority."

The obviously obstructionist stand of the White House on the issue of non-militarization of space meets with growing opposition of the broad sections of the American public. The allegiance of the administration to the "star wars" program means that the U.S. gives up the ABM Treaty, said Richard Garvin, former adviser to the President and to the defense secretary. Speaking at a news conference in New York, he stressed that the realization of that program was provocative in character and would lead to a new round of the arms race, undermine the security of the country and seriously destabilize the situation in the world.

Addressing newsmen, Cornell University Professor Z. Warhaft stressed that never before had American scientists protested so strongly and so concertedly against a definite category of armaments. He recalled that about 1,000 scientist from 39 higher educational establishments in the United States had already signed a pledge to boycott all work having to do with the "star wars" program.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ASSAILS EXPANSION OF U.S. MILITARY SPACE PROGRAMS

LD131757 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 13 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 13 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Although the present U.S. Administration is eager to portray the "Strategic Defense Initiative" as a purely research programme, the direction of the work carried out within the framework of this programme indicates that the point at issue are practical steps to create offensive space arms and a sort of a "protective shield" for U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles. Three reports, which were published today by foreign news media, are adding proof to this.

General J. Abrahamson, chief manager of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" programme, addressing journalists from Western Europe and Canada, boasted that large-scale tests of the real laser weapon, to be used in creating space arms, were conducted successfully at a test range in New Mexico last week.

Another fact. On Thursday, [12 September] the Pentagon announced that the New Space Command with the headquarters in Colorado Springs would be in operation starting September 23. It will control U.S. military space systems already deployed in near earth orbit and will also assume the functions now shared by the Air Force and Navy space commands. In other words, this is the direct step on the road of a further militarization of space.

Lastly, the NBC radio network has reported that on Thursday the U.S. Federal Court gave a green light to the testing of an anti-satellite weapon by dismissing the suit filed by a group of congressmen and scientists who drew attention to the illegal character of these tests. But these tests are a component of the Washington "star wars" programme.

The White House and the Pentagon succeeded in getting the House-Senate Conference Committee to approve 2,750 million dollars in allocations for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" programme in the next year, which is twice as much as this year.

This programme will gobble up a total of 70,000 million dollars in the next few years. This is an incredible sum for "pure research". Let us indicate for comparison that it exceeds four-fold the cost of the "Manhattan Project" and recall that the official goal

of that nuclear project too was to explore opportunities and submit options whether to realize them or not. It is common knowledge that the "research" of this kind brought about the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Now that the Pentagon was given carte blanche to develop in practice elements of the weapon system of space basing the afore-mentioned analogy is quite appropriate.

All indicates that the U.S. space militarization plans, which expose to threat the whole world, are becoming an increasingly dangerous reality.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON REASONS BEHIND U.S. MOVES TO DEPLOY SPACE ARMS

LD221851 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 22 Sep 85

[Commentary by TASS observer Yevgeniy Yegorov]

[Excerpts] The American Administration has taken actions leading directly to the beginning of the deployment of a new type of deadly weapons -- space attack means. A new stage of the arms race in space has begun. Its core is the notorious "star wars" program. One is bound to notice that the military build-up is taking place on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva and is designed, as high ranking American officials have said, to demonstrate the Reagan administration's so-called resolve and firmness.

It's worth recalling in this context that the Soviet Union has lately taken a number of specific measures which, if the United States followed suit, would stop the arms race and begin disarmament. The Soviet Union is well aware of the great significance of a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban to lessening world tension. With this in mind it has taken still another bold step along these lines. It has unilaterally suspended all nuclear explosions.

In connection with the test of antisatellite system ASAT, carried out by the United States, one should recall that the Soviet Union 2 years ago unilaterally promised not to put antisatellite systems in space. In Geneva the Soviet Union has put forward another far reaching proposal, that of a complete ban on space attack weapons, including antisatellite means and of scrapping such means already in operation.

What has the United States response been like? The United States responded to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions with another nuclear weapon test and it responded with a live test of an antisatellite weapon to the Soviet proposals of preventing the arms race from being taken into outer space. It acted in the same way in all other cases. The Soviet Union has suspended the deployment of its new medium-range missiles and other retaliatory measures in Europe.

The United States, on the contrary, has accelerated the siting of its first strike Pershing II nuclear missiles on the territory of its West European NATO allies. The Soviet Union has called for creating a zone free from chemical weapons in central Europe. The United States has launched the production of the newest and most barbarous type of chemical weapon, binary charges, with the aim of deploying them in Western Europe, first and foremost in Federal Germany -- a country that already has huge stockpiles of American chemical weapons.

This list can be prolonged. However, everything is clear even without that. There are two policies; one is designed to remove the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union has been consistently conducting that policy not because it is weak but because it is determined to protect peace, to save humanity from a nuclear holocaust. The other policy is pursued by the United States, a country which prefers to confine itself to highfalutin peace rhetoric, but in reality whips up the arms race which can push humankind into a nuclear abyss.

In a word world politics today are clearly divided into realism, responsibility, and genuine concern about the future of humanity, shown by the Soviet Union, and the adventurism of warmongers in the United States that are pushing the world into a nuclear war. All this makes one stop to think what is the United States driving at? Acts of militarism committed by the United States can only worsen the already tense international situation and Soviet-American relations. It is clear that all nations will benefit if the course towards the relaxation of tension and a stop to the arms race prevails. The Soviet Union has always been strongly committed to this policy.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. STRESSES SDI IMPORTANCE, FRANCE REJECTS IDEA

LD170712 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 17 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 17 TASS -- The U.S. Administration is not going to give up its dangerous plans connected with the spreading of the arms race to outer space and will block any efforts aimed at the prevention of the militarization of near-earth space.

This has been reaffirmed by the U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger who stressed in an interview with the CBS television company that the U.S. would not discuss President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. It is common knowledge that the "initiative" has nothing to do with defense and is aimed at creating and deploying a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements within the framework of the U.S. first-strike potential.

It is of vital importance that the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative be continued, Weinberger said. In the interview he tried to present things in such a way as though the ABM system which is being created in violation of the treaty obligations assumed by the U.S. would make it possible to "eliminate" nuclear weapons.

The U.S. which is stepping up the creation and deployment of the most up-to-date strike space weapons is going to carry out a whole series of tests of the anti-satellite systems. Lieutenant General B. Randolph, deputy head of the research programs of the U.S. Air Force, has reaffirmed that another test of the anti-satellite weapons will be staged during the coming several months. The first test against the real target in space in the course of which a two-stage missile launched from an F-15 fighter plane hit a target satellite was staged on September 13.

According to the UPI news agency, the Pentagon is going to deploy the ASAT operational strike anti-satellite system by 1987.

Paris, September 17 TASS -- The "star wars" program can become a "destabilizing factor for the strategic balance of forces," the French Prime Minister Laurent Fabius has stated, speaking at the Supreme National Defense Institute. In these conditions France is not going to support it. The head of the French Government pointed out that although Washington tried to pass off its plan as a "defense program," it was actually a program of the militarization of outer space. He stressed that the appearance of the space weapon system which would serve for the destruction of enemy missiles would inevitably bring about the deployment of offensive systems of a new generation. L. Fabius said that France favoured the observance of the 1972 treaty concluded by the USSR and the U.S. on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems.

CSO: 5200/1017

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

FRENCH DEFENSE SPACE CHIEF--Admiral Bernard Louzeau has been appointed chairman of the space studies group of the Defense Ministry by Mr Charles Hernu. The group was set up on 21 March 1985. The Defense Ministry in a communique explains that due to the increasing importance of outer space for French security the group is to carry out an examination of the use of outer space and its military consequences while also putting forward guidelines and action to be taken for the benefit of our defense system. Admiral Louzeau was the first commander of Le Redoutable, the first of our missile-launching nuclear submarines, and was commander of the Mediterranean squadron in 1983 during the events in Lebanon before being appointed 1 year later to lead the strategic ocean-going force. [Text] [Paris Domestic Service in French 1300 GMT 29 Aug 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/2788

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

MOSCOW REPORTS ON PROSPECTS OF SEVENTH SESSION

LD102230 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Sep 85

[Text] The seventh session of the Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe has opened in Stockholm. Our correspondent Valentin Gubernatorov reports from the Swedish capital:

The seventh session has opened at the height of the election campaign in Sweden. The Stockholm conference has been mentioned often in heated debates on political issues. Representatives of competing parties evaluate its work in different ways: but democratic forces are saying that it can and it has to bring its contribution to an improvement of the dangerous situation in the world, that the time has come to start concrete talks and achieve real results.

The delegates themselves, or to be more precise--many of them--reckon that there are good prerequisites for this at the present session. The great potential, founded by our initiative, for example, is to conclude an agreement on nonuse of force. Not only neutral and nonaligned countries but also a number of NATO states have voiced support for it. There are also points of proximity in the questions of trust in the military sphere. All this is making it possible today, without postponing it until tomorrow, to start working out the first agreements on confidence and security-building measures in Europe in both the political and military spheres.

Comrade Grinevskiy, ambassador and the head of the Soviet delegation, addressing the session, said that the USSR is ready to start drafting concrete texts of such agreements with everybody.

However, another trend is also emerging at the conference: a number of Western countries are stubbornly defending their proposals aiming to achieve unilateral advantages. Such an approach hinders the process of talks and hinders progress.

The Soviet delegation reckons that questions which are being discussed at the conference can be solved successfully. But to achieve this all delegates have to show political courage and good will.

CSO: 5200/1006

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

BRIEFS

POLISH, SOVIET DELEGATES' SPEECHES--Stockholm, 16 Sep (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports--Ambassador W. Konarski, head of the Polish delegation, said at a meeting of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe that he is in favor of achieving constructive agreement on measures to strengthen trust both in the political sphere and in the military sphere. Yuriy Rakhmaninov, member of the Soviet delegation, emphasized that the socialist countries' proposal for the nonuse of military force firmly occupies the leading position in the work of the Stockholm conference. During examination of this proposal, he said, considerations and ideas were expressed which deserve serious attention. The time had now come to begin talks in earnest [po sushchestvu]. However, the Soviet representative noted, it should be stated that at such a decisive [otvetstvenny] moment in the work of the conference the U.S. delegation is still hindering the achievement of accord on this key problem. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1522 GMT 16 Sep 85]

GENERAL TATARNIKOV ADDRESSES CONFERENCE--Stockholm, September 23 TASS--Member of the Soviet delegation, Major-General Viktor Tatarnikov, made today a speech at a meeting of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Viktor Tatarnikov noted that along with political initiatives the socialist countries put forward at the conference important proposals in the military sphere, among them the proposal that notification be given of major military exercises. These proposals, he stressed, embrace practically the whole spectrum of military activity--exercises of ground troops, air and naval forces and movements of troops. These proposals acquire special topicality in the present-day precarious international situation when the United States and its NATO allies are trying to turn the European Continent and adjacent sea (ocean) areas into a range for testing various versions of unleashing and conducting war. More and more frequently the United States chooses for naval exercises involving ships with cruise missiles areas near territorial waters of the Warsaw Treaty member-states. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 23 Sep 85]

GRINEVSKIY ADDRESSES PLENARY SESSION--Stockholm--The seventh session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, which will continue until 18 October, has started work in the Swedish capital. The plenary session devoted to the session opening was addressed by special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, leader of the USSR delegation.

Assessing the work done in the time that has elapsed, he stressed that the conditions for a transition to elaborating accords have matured at the Stockholm conference. He noted that there is a certain closeness in the conference participants' positions on certain aspects, particularly on the question of the nonuse of force. The speaker drew the conference participants' attention to the assessments of the prevailing international situation and the conclusions contained in the replies of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to TIME magazine. The persisting tension in the international arena and the intensifying military threat insistently require the urgent adoption of measures to stop the arms race and switch to disarmament. The speeches of the representatives of a number of Western countries voiced readiness to switch to the stage of elaborating accords, which is advocated by most conference participants. Confidence was also expressed that progress can be achieved during the conference. At the same time, the heads of the U.S., FRG, and Danish delegation reaffirmed the previous positions of the NATO countries, which run counter to the reciprocity principle and are aimed at achieving unilateral advantages for the West. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 4] [Unnamed own correspondent report: "Urgent Measures Needed"]

CSO: 5200/1006

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW COUNTERS STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL ON SS-20 DEPLOYMENT

LD182311 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] Speaking in Brussels on Tuesday, Alan Holmes, who is director of political-military affairs at the United States Department of State, alleged that the Soviet Union has installed new SS-20 missiles. He refused to say where or when. Commentary is by our observer Dmitriy Pavlov, who writes:

[Announcer read] In April this year the Soviet Union unilaterally stopped the deployment of its medium-range missiles and suspended other measures undertaken to counter the deployment of American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe. This moratorium is still in effect, as are the two other moratoriums, on all nuclear blasts, and the 2-year old one on launching antisatellite weapons. What was the American response? Less than 2 weeks after this country had stopped nuclear testing on 6 August, the United States detonated a nuclear device in Nevada. On 13 September the United States conducted a test of its ASAT weapon against the solwind satellite, which sustained a direct hit over the Pacific by a 2-stage rocket launched from an F-15 fighter.

The pattern was such that some kind of an attack or attempt to downgrade or discredit the remaining Soviet moratoriums, this time on the deployment of its medium-range missiles, was imminent. Alan Holmes of the United States State Department, didn't make us wait long with his allegation about more SS-20's appearing in the Soviet Union. The news conference in Brussels coincided with a press conference in Washington, where President Reagan made it clear that space weapons would not be negotiated and that he ruled out stopping their testing or development. What is more, the day before Mr Holmes made his anti-Soviet allegation, a spokesman for the United States Air Force in West Germany announced that in addition to the already deployed Pershing-2 missiles, the deployment there of 96 cruise missiles would begin in 1987, and that all of them would be stationed in Wusheim, Rheinland Pfals. Construction of launching pads has been underway there for many months already.

CSO: 5200/1005

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: U.S. 'COVER UP' OF NUMBER OF EUROPEAN MISSILES

LD181208 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] Brussels, September 18 TASS--TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports: The Pentagon, as it steps up the deployment of its newest medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, is bidding to conceal the true state of affairs from the public.

Ambassador Allen Holmes a division head at the State Department, claimed at a news conference here that all in all, 118 Pershing-2 and cruise missiles had been put on station in West Germany, Britain, Italy and Belgium.

But newsmen immediately caught him out trying to cover up the true number of the Pershings and cruise missiles actually prepared for launch in these countries as they reminded him that NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington recently had officially given a different figure, namely 134.

Holmes, who heads NATO's so-called special consultative group which is used by the United States to brief its allies about the course of Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms, evaded giving an answer, admitting in effect that the United States is bent on completing the deployment of medium-range missiles in Western Europe under the Pentagon's and NATO's schedule at any cost.

CSO: 5200/1005

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS CRITICIZES CONTINUED MISSILE DEPLOYMENT IN EUROPE

LD181543 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1402 GMT 18 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, 18 Sep (TASS) -- Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military affairs, writes:

In Brussels there has been a session of the NATO Special Consultative Group on questions of nuclear arms control which "discussed the prospects for agreement on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in the light of the third round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons which is starting.

How do the participants in the session imagine these "prospects?" They reaffirmed quite unambiguously their intention to continue the siting in Western Europe of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in accordance with the schedule set by the NATO leadership.

Well, with a view to "substantiating" such a, speaking directly, gloomy picture of the future and deluding the world public, it was stated that the Soviet Union -- allegedly despite the moratorium it announced -- is continuing the deployment of SS-20's. A. Holmes, chairman of the group and director of political-military affairs at the State Department, took upon himself the clearly unseemly and ignoble task of slandering the USSR in an ill-intentioned manner.

Unseemly, as Washington knows perfectly well that the Soviet Union firmly adheres to all the obligations it has undertaken, which includes the moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear means in the European part of the country which it announced. Thankless, because the USSR adopted this obligation unilaterally in a spirit of goodwill and not owing anyone, including the United States and the NATO bloc, anything. Those who try using false assertions to put this goodwill in doubt, risk having quite unflattering epithets directed at them.

However, it is evident that the Soviet unilateral moratoriums and initiatives, which are aimed at breaking the vicious circle and leading the process of arms limitation out of an impasse, have excited too much irritation and dissatisfaction in Washington already. Also "unpleasant" to it is the extremely well-disposed reaction to these steps from the world public. Washington cannot reply with similar equivalent measures, for this is not its aim and this is not how you race ahead and achieve military strategic superiority. So Washington's representatives descend into dissipation without disdaining any methods, including clear falsification of the facts.

And the facts do not come out at all in Washington's favor. Under conditions in which the unilateral Soviet moratorium on medium-range missile deployment in the European

part of the country is in force, the United States, with the support of its principal NATO allies, is continuing to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles on the Continent of Europe. On the territory of the FRG alone, for example, 54 "Pershing II" launching installations have already been sited and, according to a statement by a representative of the U.S. Air Force command, work is proceeding full steam on the construction of launching pads intended for 96 cruise missiles in Wueschheim (Rheinland-Pfalz).

In connection with the negotiations being resumed in Geneva and on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting, restraint should be shown both in words and actions. But for some people this is evidently impossible. A desire to spoil the atmosphere at the Geneva talks and the forthcoming meeting and a striving to carry out at all costs all the planned militarist programs are gaining the upper hand and determining the behavior of these Washington and NATO officials.

It remains only to remind them that when on 8 April of this year the Soviet Union declared a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country, a term for the moratorium was set -- it was to last to November of this year. The decision that will be taken in the USSR after that depends on whether the United States follows the good example and whether they halt or not the deployment of their medium-range missiles in Europe.

CSO: 5200/1005

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA: DUTCH OPPOSITION TO MISSILE DEPLOYMENT STEADFAST

PM160908 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by V. Drobkov: "No to Cruise Missile Death! Movement Against Cruise Missile Deployment in the Netherlands"]

[Text] The Hague, Sep -- As summer turns into fall, the Netherlands resembles a gigantic tourist complex, overflowing with a multilingual crowd of vacationers. Crowded excursion boats sail under the humpbacked bridges across Amsterdam's canals. In ancient Gouda, porters in national costume carry heavy trays of the famous local cheeses to please the tourists. Excited children's voices echo from Madurodam near The Hague, which is a model city consisting of miniature copies of the best known Dutch cathedrals, palaces, old merchants' homes, and even the Schiphol National Airport. In Kinderdijk, in the "Windmill Valley," the sails of wooden windmills turn above canals overgrown with reeds...

Everything seems tranquil in this small country's green fields, crisscrossed by the silver threads of the canals. But this carefree image covers up the complex problems of life in the Netherlands today.

There is the acute and still unresolved question of whether the 48 nuclear cruise missiles forced upon the country by Washington and NATO will be deployed in the Netherlands. People with placards demanding that the cruise missile death be banned from Netherlands soil can often be seen in front of the ancient parliament building in quiet The Hague. One of these demonstrators, calling himself just Piet, told me once that no matter what decision is made by the authorities here, the struggle against the buildup of nuclear arsenals in Europe will continue.

The deadline for making the final decision on the missiles is almost here. The postponement gained by the Netherlands Government last summer runs out in November. At that time, having encountered an unprecedented upsurge of the local public's anti-missile feelings, the authorities did not dare make a definite decision. Having postponed it and taken a kind of "time-out," for some reason or other the ruling circles made their final stance on the missile problem conditional on...the USSR's actions!

Under closer examination this approach, as many people in the Netherlands itself note, proves to be nothing but a cover beneath which certain forces are attempting to introduce the U.S. missiles here. It is well known that, even before the start of the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in West Europe, the Soviet Union proposed that either nuclear weapons in our continent be eliminated altogether or that the arsenals

already existing here be sharply reduced. In April of this year the USSR announced the introduction of a unilateral moratorium on missile deployment and called on NATO countries to follow this example. It would seem that the Soviet proposals not only open the way to slowing down the nuclear escalation in Europe, but also offer a real chance to embark on reducing the number of missiles. Under these circumstances, the Netherlands' refusal to allow the deployment of new nuclear missile weapons on its soil could be a constructive contribution toward improving the international situation and, at the same time, would demonstrate a truly independent and responsible approach by the country's government toward the problem of curbing the arms race.

But people in the North Atlantic bloc are still refusing to follow the Soviet Union's peace-loving initiative. Instead of showing restraint, NATO is accelerating the deployment of new missiles. In addition to the FRG, Britain, and Italy, Belgium was also involved in the missile adventure against the will of the majority of the local population. That country's parliament and public were informed of the arrival of the first 16 cruise missiles at the Florennes base only when the transport aircraft carrying them were on their way to Belgium.

This is why there is growing fear in the Netherlands that NATO militarists will attempt to repeat their "Belgian experience" here; in other words, to present the people and parliament with a fait accompli.

People in NATO are unwilling to allow even the slightest deviation from the missile deployment timetable and, while stepping up pressure on the Netherlands, are declaring for all to hear that the country will definitely accept the cruise missiles. There have been increasingly frequent visits by high-ranking "missile pushers," among them U.S. Vice President Bush, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, and other lower-ranking Atlantic visitors. For some reason, all of them, following their contacts with Netherlands official representatives, have hastened to declare their confidence that the country "will meet its obligations" to the NATO allies. The same claim has also been made by W. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander Europe.

What are the grounds for such confidence? Could it be that NATO's traveling salesman already know something that is still kept secret from the Netherlands' people and the world public?

As far as the broad strata of the Netherlands public are concerned, they still advocate a total rejection of the new missiles. They propose that an end be put to the missile race in Europe, and that this process should begin in the Netherlands. It is not only the representative movement of peace champions, but also the leading parties of the democratic opposition who are demanding that cruise missiles not be introduced onto Dutch soil. The overwhelming majority of the country's inhabitants are in favor of this. Many local municipalities have proclaimed nuclear-free zones in their territory. They include the municipality of Woensdrecht, whose territory contains a military base where the American nuclear "gifts" could be deployed.

A new mass antimissile campaign is now spreading widely in the Netherlands. A kind of referendum is being held here, in the course of which each Netherlands family will receive an open letter containing the text of a protest against missile deployment addressed to the country's government and parliament. The open letter has space for signatures by all family members. On 26 October, the eve of the missile decisionmaking, these open letters

with the gathered signatures will be handed to representatives of the government and parliament. A total of 5.3 million open letters will be printed. This unprecedented action is coordinated by the "No to Cruise Missiles" Committee, which unites the leading antiwar movements in the Netherlands.

The missile issue has also emerged in the forefront of the election campaign, which has already started here. The next parliamentary elections are scheduled for May 1986. In preparation for the elections, many parties are already elaborating their platforms and are gradually joining the struggle for votes. Attitudes toward the missiles is of great importance in this struggle. Klaas de Vries, chairman of the Defense Committee of the Second Chamber of Parliament, warns that any attempt by the government to conclude some kind of agreement on the missiles with Washington before the elections would result in a grave political crisis.

The Labor Party, which is the largest opposition party, is consistently against the deployment of nuclear missiles in the Netherlands. Its leader J. den Uyl has repeatedly declared that, in the event of victory in the elections and participation in government, his party will seek rejection of the missiles. This stance was also confirmed at the last Labor Party Congress held in Amsterdam.

The Netherlands' Communists and other left-wing opposition parties are resolutely opposed to the missiles. The latest public opinion polls show that the majority of voters are now prepared to support these antimissile forces.

The antimissile movement in the Netherlands has expanded on a large scale. The country's Supreme Court is hearing a case brought against the government by opponents of the nuclear race. They are trying to prove that the stationing of new missiles in the Netherlands is against the Constitution and other laws of the country and its international obligations. Antiwar movement activists are purchasing parcels of land around the Woensdrecht base and declare that they will not allow their land to be crossed by the communications necessary for the deployment of missiles. The construction workers' trade unions have made a decision to boycott the construction of any installations at the base. The same announcement has also been made by several construction firms. Demands are constantly heard in the country's parliament for dissociation from the missile deployment plans and other militarist schemes by the Pentagon, including the notorious "star wars" program.

The Netherlands Church and the local Catholic movement "Pax Christi" are active participants in the struggle against the missiles.

The Netherlands peace champions and the broadest strata of this small country's public are fully resolved to continue the struggle to prevent the cruise missile death from reaching their soil.

CSO: 5200/1005

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW CALLS DEPLOYMENT IN NETHERLANDS 'INEVITABLE'

LD271758 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 27 Sep 85

[From "The World Today" program, video report presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Text] Now I want to comment on one of the points in the speech of Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs Van Den Broek, at the session of the UN General Assembly.

He has announced that the Dutch cabinet would in all probability permit the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles, and added: Our participation in their deployment now seems to have become inevitable.

I will remind you of the history of the question. The Netherlands public has come out actively against the deployment of U.S. first strike nuclear weapons in their country. The Dutch Government, under pressure from public opinion, several times postponed a decision on the question. November 1 of this year was named as the final date for taking a decision.

Washington is planning to deploy 572 Pershing II and Tomahawk missiles in Western Europe, especially in Britain, the FRG, Italy and Belgium. In the territory of the relatively small country of the Netherlands, it is planning to deploy 48 missiles. Feeling that the situation in the Netherlands might develop in a direction undesirable for the United States and NATO, visitors started coming more and more often to that country from the other side of the Atlantic, as did representatives of the North Atlantic alliance. One of the ways of working on the Dutch Government and public is the publication of information known to be false, on the alleged existing superiority of the Soviet nuclear missile potential.

Evidently the pressure was not wasted. The center-right government faltered, and without waiting for a decision by parliament, began preparing a draft agreement with the United States stipulating the conditions for the deployment of cruise missiles.

It is curious that the U.S. is insisting on one point in particular: the period of validity of the agreement. They want to conclude it in such a way that it cannot be annulled for at least 5 years. This is not a formality, but rather prudence. The fact is that in 1986 there should be elections in the Netherlands. The center-right government could quite possibly be replaced by representatives of the opposition Labor Party, and the Labor party, if so happens, is against the deployment of cruise missiles. Even in the main party of the current coalition, the Christian Democrat Appeal, there is no unity on this question. So for this reason they want to draw up the agreement in such a way that a new cabinet could not revoke it. [video shows people demonstrating outside military buildings fenced off with barbed wire, a helicopter, a closeup of a notice warning people not to enter, shots of soldiers behind barbed wire]

9 October 1985

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: CLAIMS OF U.S. NUCLEAR STOCKPILES IN TURKEY VIEWED

PM231118 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Sep 85 Second Edition p 5

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA press service report "Agency Report"]

[Text] Recently the AP Agency disseminated the following report: As is clear from a statement by U.S. nuclear arms specialist W. Arkin to the journal BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, the Pentagon has currently been creating large stockpiles of nuclear warheads in Turkey. According to him, there are more than 500 nuclear warheads in depots at the Balikesir, Murted, Eskisehir, and Erhac military bases, 300 of which are nuclear aerial bombs. W. Arkin alleges that for the last 2 years these nuclear weapons have been in a state of combat readiness for use against targets in the Soviet Union and that four air force formations reinforced with these weapons are ready for action at any moment.

Although an official spokesman for the Turkish Foreign Ministry has repudiated the facts cited in the AP report, the publication of this information has attracted the close attention of the country's public. The newspapers note that "the growth of the U.S. and NATO nuclear presence in Turkey has reached an aggressive level." In their commentaries they also stress that nuclear weapons on Turkish territory pose serious problems for the country and may entail grave consequences.

According to the newspaper MILLIYET, Turkey's "important strategic position," of which the United States and the NATO allies talk so much, has brought Turkey nothing but additional difficulties and spending. This question is now assuming special topicality in connection with the preparations for the signing in December this year of a new American-Turkish agreement on "cooperation in the defense sphere," within the framework of which the United States is trying to impose new military obligations on Turkey.

In this connection an editorial in the newspaper GUNES is noteworthy. It stresses that the Soviet Union also has allies in the Warsaw Pact. However it does not have stockpiles of nuclear weapons -- either tactical or strategic -- on those countries' territory, the paper points out.

CSO: 5200/1022

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW ON THREAT OF U.S. NUCLEAR PRESENCE IN TURKEY

TA211745 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1730 GMT 19 Sep 85

[Unattributed commentary: "Expanding U.S. Nuclear Presence in Turkey"]

[Text] Currently there are 500 nuclear warheads located at the Balikesir, Eskisehir, Murted, and Erhac military bases in Turkey. Out of these, 300 can be used as atomic bombs by bomber planes. This report published by the BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTIST has caused great concern in broad Turkish social circles, as well as in the press. This feeling is quite understandable.

The storage of U.S. nuclear weapons in U.S. bases in Turkey constitutes a deadly threat, first and foremost, to the Turkish people. Judge for yourselves, dear listeners: The current policies of the U.S. Administration are directed toward accelerating the arms race which incorporates the threat of nuclear destruction. To achieve this goal, the White House is taking more dangerous steps.

Washington has not responded positively to any of the constructive Soviet proposals concerning the first nuclear strike, the ban to use nuclear weapons against countries which do not possess nuclear arms and which do not allow the storage of such arms, and the purging of various regions, including the Mediterranean Sea and the Balkans, from nuclear arms, or to other Soviet proposals.

What is the reason for this? These peaceful initiatives undertaken by the Soviet Union are in contradiction to the Pentagon's aggressive objectives. It is obvious that it is with aggressive intentions that the United States is storing nuclear arms in Turkey. As the GUNAYDIN and the BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTIST, published in the United States have pointed out, since 2 years ago, nuclear arms have been poised, ready for use against targets located in the Soviet Union. In addition to targets in the Soviet Union, these arms are also positioned against targets in various countries located in the Near and Middle East whose independent foreign policies are not in line with U.S. imperialist policies.

HURRIYET notes that an Air Force unit linked with these arms is on a constant state of alert. Thus the Pentagon can use these deadly weapons at any moment against Turkey's peace-loving neighbors. As the Istanbul daily's MILLIYET and CUMHURIYET have stressed, in the event of an armed crisis, Turkey will thus be subject to a counterattack. Both these newspapers believe that Turkish officials will take no measures to prevent the Pentagon's plans.

It is a well-known fact that all nuclear arms stored in Turkey are under the orders of U.S. generals and that Turkish authorities have no access to them. In light of the above facts it is clear that statements by U.S. and NATO officials to the effect that the foreign military presence in Turkey is due to the so-called war threat originating from the Soviet Union are lies.

Let us recall an official statement made by Ankara in 1978 concerning this issues. In that statement Turkey said that danger to Turkey came from the West and not from the Soviet Union.

Currently HURRIYET and GUNAYDIN warn that the escalation of the nuclear presence in Turkey for aggressive purposes could have grave consequences. MILLIYET states that the presence of 500 U.S. warheads in Turkey could transform the country into a nuclear cemetery in the event of a nuclear confrontation.

CSO: 5200/1005

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS ON U.S.-FRG PLANS--Bonn, September 17 TASS--A spokesman for the command of the U.S. Air Force in Ramstein, Rheinland-Pfalz, has said that 96 U.S. cruise missiles would be deployed in West Germany starting 1987. An area close to the populated locality of Wueschheim, fifteen kilometers away from the U.S. military airfield of Hahn, was chosen as the site for the new weapons. Preparatory work has been underway for a long time to build launch pads and auxiliary facilities for the weapons in the area of the planned installation of the cruise missiles. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 17 Sep 85]

CSO: 5200/1005

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS: 27 SEPTEMBER TEST HIGHLIGHTS U.S. ARMS POLICY

LD291513 Moscow TASS in English 1202 GMT 29 Sep 85

["Washington: Words and Deeds"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 29 TASS -- TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes: The United States has staged another nuclear weapons test in Nevada. The 11th this year and the second after the Soviet Union unilaterally halted all its nuclear blasts on August 6.

Following one after another, the nuclear explosions in Nevada do not just shook [as received] the ground, they are a cause of increasing concern to international public opinion.

This is only natural: One needn't be an arms specialist to realize that nuclear testing is part of the effort to develop ever more destructive systems of nuclear weapons and that an end to such testing is in effect a key to limiting the practical possibilities of producing new types of nuclear bombs and warheads.

Although the Soviet moratorium has created real opportunities for practical moves to a general and complete ban on nuclear tests, the United States has continued pressing ahead with such testing.

This bears out visually that the Washington administration is bent on executing a policy of building up arms rather than curbing the arms race.

And the nuclear test is not the only evidence to support this conclusion. Take any aspect of the problem of disarmament and you'll see that Washington's line is the same in all areas.

It is banking on force and keen to get military superiority at any cost, by hook or by crook.

The examples, stably, are galore.

The USSR has suggested in the United Nations that international cooperation be pursued in the practical exploration of outer space, while keeping it free from arms. And the U.S. response has been to test an anti-satellite (ASAT) system, demonstrating a resolve to rev up preparations for "star wars".

The Soviet Union suspended the deployment of its medium-range systems way back on April 7, whereas the United States, having installed more than 200 Pershings and cruise missiles, in Western Europe, is still continuing to build up this group of first-strike arms.

It is especially alarming that all these provocative militarist activities are taking place at a time when another round of Soviet-American talks on the most important aspect of arms control has gone under way in Geneva, while the world looks forward to the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting, hoping that it will help ease tensions and remove the war threat.

What are these activities conducted for?

Plainly, if in Washington, where they have been claiming publicly again and again that they want the Geneva summit meeting to be "constructive and positive", they really want to show a constructive approach to this meeting, those responsible for preparing for it ought to be involved not in sabre-rattling, but in real, businesslike constructive work towards solving pressing international problems on the sole possible basis of equality and equal security, the basis of genuine concern for fending off the war threat.

The U.S. President said in a recent televised interview that the Soviet Union's propaganda-making "intrigues" had made it wear a white hat, while leaving him with a black one. So Reagan recalled an old Hollywood trick whereby "you identify the villain by the color of the hat".

The President, who started his career in Hollywood, knows the tricks of the American movie business for sure.

But one really oughtn't compare the international affairs and problems that are central to the very destiny of human civilization today to a Hollywood movie show. And the international public does not at all want to be the apathetic viewer of such shows.

So if the U.S. Administration appears to be "the villain" in public eyes, this should be blamed not on anybody's "ill-intentioned propaganda-making" but on the aggressively hegemonistic policy of the American Administration itself, a policy vigorously opposed by the people pressing for peace and lesser international tension.

CSO: 5200/1020

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: U.S. NUCLEAR TEST AFFECTS REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

PM121554 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Is This the Way To Prepare for the Meeting?"]

[Text] The U.S. President has repeatedly cited V.I. Lenin in his speeches. There can be no objection to this in principle. Lenin is available to all, be they friends or enemies. His works have been published, according to UNESCO data, in 134 languages of the world's peoples. Lenin is studied both to follow him and to combat him. In any event, the reading of Lenin's works undoubtedly helps to improve political culture, broaden intellectual horizons, and gain a better understanding of the Soviet Union's policy. It is, however, a pity that people in the White House quote Lenin without reading him. Evidently untrained aides let their chief down and he gets himself into trouble.

Here is the latest example: In an interview with representatives of the U.S. college radio network, R. Reagan cited what he described as the following "eloquent" statement of Lenin's: "We must capture East Europe." And one more -- if you'll pardon the expression -- "quotation": "We are organizing the Asian hordes." This, I repeat, was said not by some ordinary "Kremlinologist" or professor of "Sovietology" -- their statements are, as people say, like water off a duck's back. It was said by the U.S. President, the highest official in the country.

It is absurd to even attempt to prove that V.I. Lenin did not utter and could not have uttered the aforementioned words. And it is perhaps pointless to write that the attribution of such words to Lenin is sacrilege. Let us view the issue from another angle: Why did the White House chief find it necessary to resort to such base methods of political propaganda?

In my view, the answer is not too difficult. At this very moment the Americans are preparing for the Geneva summit meeting. In the process of preparing for the Geneva dialogue the United States carried out a new nuclear explosion. In the process of the very same preparations an antisatellite weapon will be tested there in a few days' time. As part of the very same process there has been an escalation of anti-Soviet rhetoric and an intensive desire to distort and discredit our country's policy.

Generally speaking, we have long been accustomed to this. And there may be no particular point in accusing our opponents for the umpteenth time of failing to observe the elementary rules of political polemics. There would be no point -- if times were ordinary. But the present times are not ordinary. A chance exists, still exists, to halt the deterioration in Soviet-American relations, to agree on ending the arms race, and to give people a chance to breathe freely. These, from the USSR's viewpoint, are the objectives of the Geneva meeting.

Our constructive stance was presented in a calm, businesslike, and well-argued fashion by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in an interview with TIME magazine. We do not want confrontation. We do not want to spend money on increasingly terrible and sophisticated weapons. And this is not because we are weak and affected by the notorious American "trump cards" but because we rely on common sense instead of strength.

The logical and convincing nature of the Soviet approach to Geneva and the practical steps already taken by the Soviet Union, including the moratorium on nuclear tests, have in our view created favorable conditions and a favorable political background for the Soviet-American talks.

And it must be said that this is the viewpoint from which world public opinion and a considerable section of the U.S. public have perceived Moscow's invitation to a serious and responsible dialogue, a dialogue leading to specific, tangible political results.

I will cite the opinions of an Englishman and an American. "The White House," S. Hoggart wrote in London's THE OBSERVER, "is preparing to spend the next few weeks coping with what is beginning to look like a global propaganda disaster. As the United States steps up preparations for the November summit, the 'great communicator,' as President Reagan is often called here, finds himself defeated each time...." And now THE WASHINGTON POST, and I quote J. Kraft: "The Russians are scoring propaganda victories along the way to the Geneva summit. The United States could deprive them of this pleasure by putting forward any kind of specific arms control proposal. Hitherto, however, President Reagan has been emphasizing propaganda rather than anything substantial." Accurately put. The U.S. Administration is doing everything to avoid "anything substantial." It thinks in different terms. It does not like the positive response encountered by the Soviet approach to the Geneva conversations. It does not like the obvious approval which greets the repeated Soviet proposals on the entire range of disarmament problems. And the task is therefore set: Reduce the effect of the Soviet arguments as much as possible, avoid the essence of questions subject to discussion, and drown real political problems in propaganda cliches to which the western ear is accustomed. It is in this context that the "lessons in Leninism" given to us by the U.S. President must be seen.

I am convinced that the Soviet leaders will not repay R. Reagan in kind. Serious politics demands serious and considered words. The responsibility of the two powers is too great. And so long as there is even the slightest chance of reaching agreement in Geneva, finding and determining spheres of common or parallel interests, and defining the outlines of mutually acceptable compromise solutions, we will struggle for this chance in all earnestness.

CSO: 5200/1020

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET GENERAL CHERVOV VIEWS U.S. REJECTION OF MORATORIUM

AU161425 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 14 Sep 85 p 6

[Interview given by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of the Operations Main Directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, to V. Morozov, APN military commentator: "Moratorium -- A Realistic Step Toward Disarmament; Colonel General N. Chervov on Problems of USSR-U.S. Relations"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is RUDE PRAVO's introduction]

[Text] The world public is calling the Soviet Union's decision on the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of 6 August 1985 an example of a truly peace-loving attitude and a serious and timely step toward halting the deadly feverish armament. In a talk with V. Morozov, APN military commentator, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of a General Staff administration of the USSR Armed Forces, comments on the military aspects of the new Soviet peace initiative.

[Morozov] In his interview for the American TIME magazine, Mikhail Gorbachev stated: "A total halt of nuclear tests would halt feverish nuclear armament in the qualitatively most dangerous direction." Where would this be specifically manifested?

[Chervov] In a way, the nuclear arms tests accelerate feverish nuclear armament. Without them, in fact, both the development [vyvoj] of new types and kinds of nuclear arms and the perfection of the types and kinds already in existence are impossible. Thus, a renunciation of tests would represent an effective measure which would first radically slow down and then, totally halt the entire development process.

Above all, the technology of producing nuclear charges and thus, the development of new types of charges would be halted; the new development trends in nuclear ammunition would be excluded. In order to get a better idea of this, let us mention an example. Had the United States agreed to our proposals on the general and total ban on nuclear tests at the beginning of the sixties, when the treaty banning nuclear tests in the air, outer space, and underwater was being prepared, then today's nuclear arsenals would not contain many particularly dangerous types of armament; such as ballistic missiles with multiple maneuvering of launching pads and American neutron weapons and other kinds of armament would not be stocked.

Understandably, this would have also been reflected in other areas. In fact, if it were impossible to test the already existing nuclear ammunition, it would soon become obsolete and gradually lose its combat capability because it is exactly for the purpose of maintaining combat capability that periodic checkup tests are necessary. This would provide an impulse for gradually reducing the accumulated arsenals and for concluding a treaty on the total and general halt of nuclear arms tests.

This makes it obvious that the halting of nuclear explosions represents the realistic possibility of preventing a further augmentation of nuclear arsenals, resolving the issues of their reduction and, finally, their total liquidation. If the American ruling figures really want to "let nuclear arms become obsolete" [zestarnout], as they themselves say, then the USSR's proposal on mutually halting nuclear tests opens a direct path toward this, a path based on the equal security of both countries. Thus, whether the year 1986 will become the year in which at least two world nuclear powers will not carry out nuclear explosions depends solely on the U.S. Government.

[Morozov] The representatives of the U.S. Administration declare the Soviet Union is submitting proposals of moratoriums, and thus, the proposal on a moratorium on nuclear explosions, only on those occasions when this will give it a unilateral military advantage. What can you say about this?

[Chervov] Nothing is further from the truth than such statements. The Soviet Union -- and the top authorities in our country have pointed this out time and again -- is not striving to achieve supremacy over the United States and the NATO countries; it is not striving to achieve military supremacy over these states. Under the conditions of the existing military-strategic equilibrium, a mutual suspension [pozastaveni] of efforts in the military sphere by both sides cannot yield unilateral disadvantages either for the USSR or for the United States. On the contrary, this effort establishes favorable conditions for a subsequent solution of the issues of disarmament and of consolidating security on equal foundations.

You should notice that, in resolving many complicated issues connected with moderating feverish armament, the Soviet Union submitted the proposal on a bilateral (USSR, United States) moratorium or else on a unilateral moratorium, in the hope of a positive response on the part of the United States. But, of course, the United States is reacting negatively to any Soviet proposal. It is doing this not because it lags behind the Soviet Union in the military sense, as Washington claims. No, the United States is not acceding to a moratorium particularly because it does not want to halt feverish armament even for a single day. At the same time, it is getting into absurd situations in presenting even the USSR's unilateral moratorium as the Soviet Union's attempt to achieve military supremacy over the United States.

[Morozov] And what is the reality?

[Chervov] I can demonstrate it with several examples:

During the Soviet-American Geneva talks, the USSR submitted a number of specific constructive proposals, among them the proposal on a mutual moratorium on nuclear and space arms. Why did it do this? Because the Soviet Union is endeavoring to achieve positive results in the solution of the entire complex of issues. At the same time, the Soviet Union regards the adoption of the moratorium on nuclear and space arms merely as the first step toward reducing the arsenals of nuclear weapons. This is also affirmed by another of our proposals: that in case of the adoption of the moratorium, the two sides submit, let us say within 1-2 months, specific proposals on the levels to which they would be willing to reduce strategic weapons.

[Morozov] Here a question arises: Who wins in such a case, and who loses?

[Chervov] The answer is quite unambiguous: It is bilaterally advantageous, provided both sides are striving to conclude an agreement.

Let us take another example. We have submitted a moratorium on the deployment [rozmistovaní] of intermediate-range missiles in Europe and we have unilaterally suspended [pozastavili] their deployment in Europe. Our commitment is also valid at present. However, the world public is expecting an answer from the United States. But, the United States continues increasing the number of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, which are targeted at the Soviet Union. By doing this, Washington wants to acquire unilateral military advantages at the cost of the Soviet Union's security and, let us say, frankly, at the cost of the security of Western Europe.

Let us regard, for instance, the USSR's unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear arms. Here, too, the United States is obdurate, in the obvious endeavor to appropriate the right to unleash a nuclear war.

A similar obstinacy is also manifested now. By rejecting the halting of nuclear explosions, the United States actually wants to preserve for itself the opportunity to perfect nuclear armament and to further escalate feverish armament. This is also testified to by the demonstrative nuclear explosion of 17 August in Nevada, including the ploy of inviting observers to American nuclear tests. In this way, the United States is striving to achieve a confirmation of the justification of its line, oriented toward the imperative continuation of nuclear explosions and thus, the development of new and newer kinds of nuclear weapons. In the endeavor to camouflage their negative attitude toward the Soviet moratorium, the American representatives declare that the USSR is submitting the implementation of the moratorium only so that the United States not be able to catch up with it. But, of course, the facts say something different.

[Morozov] In 1985, prior to the declaration of the moratorium, the USSR carried out practically the same number of nuclear explosions as the United States. But, if we speak of all nuclear tests, then the Soviet Union carried out almost one-third fewer tests than the United States.

[Chervov] In that case, with whom does the United States want to "catch up"? With whom does it want to "catch up," this country which owns approximately two-thirds of the total arsenal of nuclear ammunition, which even today has about 30 types of nuclear ammunition in its arsenal?

This makes it obvious that all the clamor about "lagging" is merely an empty excuse. In reality, the moratorium hampers the Pentagon which is carrying out more than 20 programs for developing new types of nuclear arms. It is testing nuclear warheads for new means of conducting a nuclear war, for the MX, the Trident II and the Minuteman first-strike missiles and also for cruise missiles deployed on various kinds of launching pads. It is testing new nuclear air force bombs, neutron weapons, and also laser ammunition for the "star wars" program.

The Pentagon obviously does not want all these programs to be halted and that is why the political leadership is coming out with newer and newer fabrication about the USSR's "supremacy," this time in the field of nuclear tests.

However, the Soviet Union is resolutely striving to achieve a normalization of Soviet-American relations. We are taking specific practical steps toward this; among them, a top priority is the effort to halt all nuclear explosions. We believe that Washington's negative reaction to the Soviet moratorium is not the last word said by the U.S. Administration. In this context, replying to the questions of a TASS correspondent, Mikhail Gorbachev stated: "We wish the American leadership to reply positively to our declaration. However, the public pronouncements of Washington's official representatives on the moratorium issue create the impression that, deplorably, Washington is busily looking for ways to evade such a reply as cleverly as possible. I will not err in saying that the world expects a different approach."

NUCLEAR TESTING

PRAVDA HITS U.S. RESPONSE ON TEST MORATORIUM, 'STAR PEACE'

PM031546 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 85 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Tolkunov dispatch: "Why Washington Is Opposed When the World Is in Favor"]

[Text] New York, 30 Aug--The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, whose announcement was greeted with satisfaction by the world public, is now in its fourth week of operation. But is there anything new in this regard in the American capital? Virtually nothing. "The Reagan Administration has adopted a stance toward it as if it were an act of terrorism," WASHINGTON POST correspondent M. (Makgrori) writes sarcastically about Washington's reaction to the Soviet initiative.

From the Pentagon chief to the various propaganda services, many people in the American capital are trying to discredit the proposal. The method used is not new: The Soviets, they say, are ahead in the number of explosions, they cannot be trusted--there is no appropriate verification--and in general such proposals are made during closed negotiations rather than in public, which allegedly undermines the whole process of arms control and even the sides' confidence....

"The White House talks about some kind of Moscow propaganda plot. Of course, when you are building more and more new missiles and warheads, there is nothing you can say in reply. That is why, exposing this myopic course, our organization, which has more than 1,400 branches in every state, has decided to collect signatures in support of this most important initiative," says M. (Fayn), spokesman for the national nuclear disarmament campaign.

"Unfortunately," R. (Boem), member of the leadership of the public organization, the committee of lawyers on nuclear policy, writes in NEWSDAY, "many of us still do not fully appreciate the importance and timeliness of such an accord. For, after all, without tests there will be no new weapons created. If you create no new weapons, you have nothing to deploy. With no deployment there is no arms race. So what the Soviet Union has proposed is a very simple but at the same time constructive initiative."

Reflecting the opinion of thinking America, A. Harriman, who headed the American delegation at the talks to elaborate the 1963 treaty banning nuclear

weapons tests in the three environments, considers that the moratorium could open the way to the signing of an all-embracing agreement in this sphere. And this, the senior American politician and public figure states, could remove the nuclear threat and create a climate of trust at the nuclear arms control talks and elsewhere.

The administration's argument about the "impossibility of verifying" tests has proved to be far-fetched. It has been exposed even by American scientists and specialists, who say quite the contrary. "We are deeply convinced that the present level of seismology and techniques for monitoring seismic waves are wholly adequate to ensure that a secret test program of explosions, even with a yield of less than 1 kiloton, would be immediately detected by the seismic system," (Dzh. Everden), a leader of the national center for earthquake studies, and Professor L. (Sayks) of Columbia University consider. That is why, in their words, the delay in formulating an all-embracing treaty is motivated by purely political rather than scientific or technical reasons.

UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar states: "I appeal for renewed efforts to conclude a treaty on an all-embracing ban on nuclear tests. No other agreement could have such great significance in limiting further improvement of nuclear weapons. It would be the litmus test of genuine readiness to achieve nuclear disarmament."

As the new Soviet initiative shows, the Soviet Union is ready to renew the talks on this problem which were broken off by the United States. It has also shown its readiness to ensure that a treaty on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapons tests should initially come into force only for three of the states possessing nuclear weapons if the other two are not ready for this at the very outset. It was with this aim that the USSR, back in 1982, submitted for the UN General Assembly examination draft basic provisions for such a treaty, which took account of the degree of agreement reached by the USSR, the United States, and Britain at earlier talks and the wishes of other countries. Thus, it envisaged both national and international monitoring measures.

This stance enjoys broad approval and support in UN circles.

"We consider," Mexican representative Garcia Robles has stated, "that such a stance by one of the two states possessing major nuclear arsenals is inspiring and constructive."

"We consider," Swedish delegate R. Ekeus said, "that the modernization of nuclear arms speeds up the arms race and leads to a disruption of stability in relations among the nuclear powers. There are no insuperable obstacles to treaty verification. A mutual moratorium would undoubtedly be the interim measure which could most effectively facilitate the conclusion of an all-embracing treaty."

That is what the world thinks. Pentagon General R. (Sekser), however, thinks differently. "The program of underground nuclear tests" he states, "is indispensable for assessing the survivability of our military systems, in the event of nuclear war, predicting the degree of destruction to enemy military installations, and developing techniques to increase the survivability and reliability of our forces."

As is well known, the U.S. Administration's response to the Soviet moratorium was to hasten to carry out another nuclear explosion in the Nevada desert. The White House has informed Congress that a series of antisatellite weapons tests is planned soon. And it is doing this in a deliberately ostentatious way at a time when the Soviet Union is continuing to carry out its declared moratorium on deploying and testing these weapons and when it has submitted for UN examination yet another initiative aimed at preventing an arms race in space, proposing that the question "On International Cooperation in the Peaceful Use of Outer Space Under the Conditions of Its Nonmilitarization" be included on the 40th General Assembly Session's agenda.

What official Washington thinks about is "Star Wars," rather than the "Star Peace" advocated by the overwhelming majority of representatives of the international community within the United Nations and other international forums. H. Bethe, the well-known physicist and participant in the Manhattan Project, considers, along with many other scientists and specialists, that the President's "strategic defense initiative" is aimed not at "saving mankind," as the White House says, but purely at acquiring a first strike potential and strategic superiority. Indeed, if Washington is seriously concerned about the fate of peace, why does it not join in the moratorium and stop all nuclear explosions? But the problem is that the one militarist venture is tightly wedded to the other: Whereas the modernized warheads for new strategic offensive systems are designed to "breach" the enemy's defense, they want to try to contain a retaliatory strike using their "space weapons," which, certain strategists here think, will also make it possible for the United States to dictate nuclear ultimatums.

However, H. Bethe and former U.S. Defense Secretary R. MacNamara warn from the pages of ATLANTIC magazine that the Soviet Union is capable, as it showed even during the most difficult postwar period, of taking appropriate counter-measures of deterrence.

G. Brown, member of the House of Representatives, considers that in refusing to support the nuclear moratorium and ostentatiously announcing a series of antisatellite weapon tests the United States is undermining the chances of progress at the November summit meeting and of positive changes at the Geneva talks on nuclear space arms. Unfortunately, congressmen are not going beyond addressing individual critical remarks to the White House. After approving, with certain provisos, the Pentagon's budget, which provides appropriations for the nuclear space program, they calmly dispersed for their summer vacation. But, after all, whose job is it if not theirs to ponder the fact that by its militarist programs the White House is not only creating obstacles for talks in progress but is also undermining existing accords--the ABM treaty and other agreements.

The impression is being created that, despite all the talk about internal disagreements regarding foreign policy strategy and tactics, the Washington administration is preparing public opinion in good time for continued

deadlock. It is difficult to make any other assessment of the speech delivered recently in Santa Barbera by Robert MacFarlane, assistant to the President for national security affairs, in which he spoke of the American side's intention to "show firmness" in Geneva and the need for the kind of "concessions" which the Russians will scarcely make.

"Thus," the American Communist paper DAILY WORLD writes on this score, "whenever people demand an end to the arms race and improved relations with the Soviet Union it is followed by a stepping up of cold war rhetoric and anti-Soviet propaganda from the administration."

"Why is it necessary to continue taking the risk of fanning an arms race which can only result in losers?" is the far from rhetorical question posed in a NEW YORK TIMES editorial.

The question is clearly addressed to the White House.

CSO: 5200/1020

NUCLEAR TESTING

PRAVDA CITES FOREIGN, U.S. SUPPORT FOR MORATORIUM

PM110905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup dated 9 September: "Following a Peace-Loving Course"]

[Excerpt] Continuing to comment on M. S. Gorbachev's replies to the American TIME magazine, the international public and press evaluate highly the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at reducing tension, ending the arms race, and eliminating the nuclear threat. Prominent politicians and public figures and press organs of many countries are sharply critical of the U.S. Administration's unconstructive stance ahead of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

The world's peoples passionately wish for an improvement in the international situation, for effective steps in the cause of detente on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security, and for an end to the arms race on earth and its prevention in space, W. Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, declared in Berlin. The working people and the entire people of the GDR wholly support the USSR's constructive initiatives. All forces of reason and realism must unite today to prevent the use of weapons with tremendous destructive power.

The Czechoslovak people fully support the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy, thanks to which the peoples of Europe have been living in peace for 40 years, M. Jakes, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, emphasized. In his replies to the questions put by the American TIME magazine M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, once again demonstrated the USSR's sincere desire to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and strengthen peace throughout the world.

The Soviet peace initiatives are receiving a high appraisal in the United States. Republican Senator C. Mathias, a well-known American politician, emphasized that the implementation of the Soviet Union's proposal to establish a mutual Soviet-U.S. moratorium on all nuclear explosions would be a significant step toward ending the arms race and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In an article published in THE BALTIMORE SUN he points out that the resumption of the talks aimed at concluding a treaty on a total ban on nuclear tests, which, as is known, were unilaterally broken off by the White House, would be regarded by all countries as a reassuring signal. The reaching of a Soviet-U.S. accord to ban nuclear tests, the senator writes, would set an example to the whole world and help to end the proliferation of nuclear arms--an aim which accords with the common interests of all countries, both nuclear and nonnuclear. The Reagan administration's refusal to resume these talks,

Mathias points out, turns the United States into a target for criticism. The senator condemned Reagan's "Star Wars" program. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" announced by the President, he emphasizes, "ignores the important lesson which led to the conclusion of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. The development of strategic defense systems will merely intensify the race for offensive arms."

The Soviet Union's unilateral introduction of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, E. Markey, member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, writes in the BOSTON GLOBE, "opens the door to ending all nuclear tests." In the light of the fact that the Soviet initiative provides us with a good opportunity, the congressman pointed out, "purposeful efforts must be made in the United States itself with a view to making the Reagan administration abandon its opposition to the very idea of holding talks on a total nuclear test ban." Markey condemned the White House attempts to "exclude such important issues as the ending of nuclear tests from the summit agenda."

Moscow, the WASHINGTON POST writes, is conducting a vigorous campaign in the arms control sphere, which has intensified following the publication of M. S. Gorbachev's TIME magazine interview and his meeting with American senators. In each of these instances M. S. Gorbachev made it clear that Russia is prepared to join with the United States in the matter of radical nuclear arms reductions. However, the American strategic initiative known as the "Star Wars" program remains an obstacle in the way of an accord. "The purport of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statements has penetrated the consciousness even of certain hard-nosed Americans. Thus, the meeting in Moscow produced an impression on Sam Nunn, the Democratic camp's specialist on military matters in the Senate. A still greater impression was produced on West Europeans. They are impressed by the Soviet leader, who does not let the Americans order him about. They do not like 'Star Wars.' M. S. Gorbachev produces a great impression as an attractive, energetic, and highly informed man." The newspaper urges the U.S. Administration to display a constructive approach to the upcoming summit meeting.

CSO: 5200/1020

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET ARMY PAPER: MORATORIUM CAN HELP SLOW ARMS RACE

PM271129 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin "Military-Political Review": "Washington's Nuclear Sabotage"]

[Text] For four decades now the United States has been continuing a nuclear arms race which is dangerous to the future of the world. For four decades the nuclear "sword of Damocles" has hung over mankind. Twice already, through the fault of American imperialism, it has fallen on the heads of the defenseless citizens of Japanese cities--Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Now that sword is raised again, raised over the peoples of the whole world, creating a mortal danger to the future of world civilization.

To safeguard the world against the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe--that is the main concern of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In the present tense international situation, which is weighed down by the burden of the arms race on earth and the danger of its spreading into space, the Soviet Union wages an energetic, tireless struggle for the limitation and eventual elimination of means of mass destruction and the creation of an atmosphere of trust and peaceful cooperation between states.

The USSR's new large-scale peace initiatives are also aimed at achieving these goals. As is well known, from 6 August of this year it stopped all nuclear explosions, and it then proposed that the question of the nonmilitarization of space and international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space be included on the agenda for the 40th UN General Assembly Session.

The moratorium imposed by the Soviet Union has been announced as lasting until 1 January 1986, but will remain in force after that date if the United States, for its part, also refrains from conducting nuclear explosions.

Indeed, tests act as a kind of accelerator of the nuclear arms race. The cessation of nuclear explosions would be an effective measure acting as a strong brake on that whole process. If there are no tests, there will be no modernization of existing types of nuclear weapons or creation of new types, since such tests are an integral part of their development. And many such types of weapons are being developed in the United States. Suffice it to say

that every day five new warheads are added to the already huge nuclear arsenal. Just 1 MX ICBM, fitted with 10 warheads of 800 kilotons each, is capable of instantaneously burning up and turning into a radioactive desert an area of more than 100 square km.

A moratorium would help stop the further improvement of lethal nuclear weapons. And that, in turn, means that a real barrier could be placed in the path of the nuclear arms race, which is fraught with the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

"...The only important event in the arms control sphere since the signing of the SALT II Treaty"—that is how E. Carroll, deputy director of the Center for Defense Information in Washington, assessed the Soviet decision.

A world without nuclear explosions—that prospect accords with the aspirations and hopes of all the peoples. What prevents this possibility from becoming a reality?

The main reason is the militarist, adventurist policy of the U.S. leadership and Washington's reluctance to halt the nuclear arms conveyor belt. And this policy is pursued in the illusory hope of acquiring military superiority over the Soviet Union. In order somehow to justify itself, the White House invents various kinds of "motives" and "arguments" in favor of its unconstructive stance.

What are these so-called "arguments?"

They say, for instance, that the Soviet Union has supposedly completed an intensive series of nuclear explosions and can allow itself a respite, and that the USSR is ahead of the United States in the development and modernization of nuclear weapons.

But that is not how matters really stand at all. In imposing a unilateral moratorium the Soviet Union cut short a program of tests without completing it. And prior to the announcement of the moratorium, the USSR had this year carried out virtually the same number of nuclear tests as the United States. If you take all nuclear tests, since 1945 the United States has carried out at least one-third more than the Soviet Union.

Elementary logic indicates that given this correlation in the number of tests, the Americans were hardly lagging behind. Let us recall that at one time Washington used to speak of a "lag" in strategic bombers, and later in missiles. But each time this was deliberate deception! The number of Soviet bombers was deliberately exaggerated 3- or 4-fold and the Soviet "missile threat" was exaggerated 15- to 20-fold. This was later admitted even in Washington.

People across the ocean also refer to the problem of verification. This is roughly how the reasoning goes: What is the point of agreeing to stop nuclear weapons tests, if there are no 100-percent reliable agreed verification methods? Once again, this is a clumsy ruse. Both we and the United States and other countries have scientific-technical means which provide the necessary degree of confidence that a nuclear explosion, even a small one, will be detected.

In this connection it is apposite to recall that the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests signed by the USSR and the United States 3 July 1974 provided for a verification system. Had Washington ratified this treaty, the sides would long since have exchanged geological and geographical information on firing ranges and test areas and calibration explosions would have been carried out in order to set the seismic apparatus. But Washington refuses to ratify the 1974 treaty, and thus rejects the entire verification system without even testing it in practice.

Back in 1982 the White House refused to resume the trilateral talks between the USSR, the United States, and Britain, which had lasted for 5 years before then, with the aim of preparing and concluding a treaty on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. Had it not been for Washington's sabotage, both verification and the international exchange of seismic data would already have been organized. A legal basis would have emerged for on-site checks.

It is sometimes said that the question of ending nuclear weapons tests must be examined at the Geneva disarmament conference. A bilateral cessation of tests, they say, would not make the world any more tranquil or secure.

True, a bilateral moratorium does not resolve all the tasks. But it would help to develop those elements of confidence without which success at the Geneva talks is inconceivable, and would create favorable conditions for the preparation of an international treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban.

As for the Soviet Union, it is prepared to discuss this question without delay. It is prepared at any moment to come to the conference table with a view to the speediest conclusion of such a treaty for all time, without setting any preliminary conditions. The Soviet Union is willing to hold these talks in any form acceptable to the other side, be it within the framework of trilateral or multilateral talks. Moreover the Soviet Union has already submitted the basic provisions of such a treaty for examination by the disarmament conference.

It is not, therefore, a question of at what forum to examine the ending of nuclear weapon tests. It is a question of examining this problem seriously and without delay, and this means with a view to the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. No sensible person can deny that a bilateral moratorium could only promote the attainment of important accords.

People in Washington also explain their refusal to follow the Soviet Union's good example by saying that the ending of nuclear weapon tests will lead to the weakening of U.S. nuclear might. It will not be possible to create new types of nuclear devices. Their modernization will slow down. The testing of the reliability of the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons will become impossible.

True enough. But this is equally true for the Soviet Union. There will be a parallel lowering of the levels of nuclear confrontation between the USSR and the United States. Do not the peoples have a vital interest in that? And do not America's present rulers verbally call for that? But that is the point—they only call for it verbally. In practice, they do not want to curb the arms race. They need more and more new nuclear weapons, and therefore new nuclear explosions to test them.

Official Washington's reaction to the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union reveals, like litmus paper, the insincerity and demagoguery of the White House.

All the same, what happened to make Washington suddenly start refusing 3 years ago to have anything to do with the treaty between the USSR, the United States, and Britain on a general and complete nuclear test ban, which was almost ready, and then refuse to support the Soviet moratorium?

The point is that in the minds of Washington's politickers the reckless plan for "Star Wars" preparations, now called the "Strategic Defense Initiative," had already taken shape. The plan was made public 23 March 1983. It is noteworthy that immediately after this, on 29 March, the fuss started about the revision of the verification provisions envisaged by the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The fabricated question of verification began to serve the American administration as a braking device in the discussion of any problems concerning the ending of tests on nuclear devices. In a word, sinister plans for the militarization of space are behind the U.S. ruling circles' reluctance to follow the Soviet Union's good example.

Matters are moving toward filling space with weapons in the strict sense of the word. Concrete developments aimed at the creation of space strike means of destruction are already under way. The United States has allocated twice as many funds for space military systems in the next fiscal year, 1986, as last year. "I exclude the possibility of the renunciation of strategic defense at either the research stage or the deployment stage," Defense Secretary Weinberger states, making no secret of it. The Pentagon's share in the use of the Shuttle ships is steadily increasing. New types of weapons are being created which are no less dangerous than nuclear weapons and are based on different physical principles--accelerator weapons, ultra high frequency weapons, radio wave weapons, and so forth. It is also proposed to use nuclear weapons in space--third generation nuclear weapons. Issuing a challenge to mankind, the White House carried out its latest underground nuclear explosion, and then announced its intention of testing the ASAT combat anti-satellite system in the near future. Washington seeks to harness its closest allies to the "Star Wars" program. The unlimited-duration Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems is being undermined. In a word, the task of preparing space strike arms is put forward by the White House as a priority state task, and its implementation is being transferred to a practical footing by the U.S. military-political leadership.

Common sense indicates that in order to preserve peace, it is necessary to curb the nuclear arms race, stop the creation of space strike weapons, and on this basis go over to the reduction of arms stockpiles, especially nuclear arms. That is precisely the action called for by the Soviet Union. It is now up to the United States.

NUCLEAR TESTING

AUSTRALIA HOSTS PACIFIC PEACE TALKS TO FOCUS ON FRENCH TESTS

HK250429 Hong Kong AFP in English 0258 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] Sydney, 25 Sep (AFP)--French nuclear testing at Mururoa Atoll is to be one of the key issues at a 20-nation peace conference on the Pacific and Asian regions here next month.

A spokesman for the organisers, Stephanie Coory, said French colonialism in the Pacific also would come under scrutiny at the four-day conference which begins on 24 October.

Ms Coory said leading trade unionists and peace workers from countries bordering the Indian and Pacific Oceans, including China, the United States and the Soviet Union, would attend the conference.

In addition, East Germany and Hungary had advised they would be sending representatives.

Ms Coory said invitations had not been sent to West European nations and France would not be represented at the conference.

"However, we expect a Kanak representative from New Caledonia, Mr Louis Uregei Kotra, to tell us about independence progress for the French territory," she said.

"The French nuclear tests will be of great concern to many of the Pacific nations and plenary sessions will explore the recent South Pacific forum nuclear free zone treaty, as well as military threats and foreign bases in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and actions to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace," she said.

Ms Coory said speakers would include New Zealand Federation of Labour President Jim Knox, Indrajit Gupta of the All India Trade Union Congress, Dr V. David, vice-president of the Malaysia Trade Union Congress, Mahendra Chaudry of the Fiji Trade Union congress, World Peace Council President Romesh Chandra and several leading Australian politicians and trade unionists.

Among others expected are He Xiguan, secretary-general of the Chinese Committee for Peace and Disarmament, four members of the Soviet Peace Committee and representatives of various United Nations Agencies.

Asian and Pacific countries which will be represented at the conference are Australia, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh, Laos, Vietnam, the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia, Fiji, the Philippines, New Zealand and China.

CSO: 5200/4301

NUCLEAR TESTING

BRIEFS

AUSTRALIAN TEST MONITORING CENTER--The Strategic and Defense Studies Center at the Australian National University in Canberra says that within 2 years Australia will have an international data center to monitor nuclear weapons tests. The head of the studies center, Dr Desmond Ball, says the center will be the first of its kind in the world. Other international data centers will later be set up in Washington, Stockholm and Moscow. Dr Ball says the centers will exchange seismic data through the World Meteorological Organization to check the observance of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 13 Sep 85]

AUSTRALIAN LAWYER CRITICIZES UK STATEMENT--The British Government's final written submission to the McClelland royal commission into nuclear tests in Australia has been labeled a suspect document aimed at subverting the commission's finding. Council representing aboriginal group, Mr (Jeff Eames), today told the commission that the British had knowingly made errors throughout the atomic test program in Australia in the 1950's and 1960's. Mr (Eames) said, in an attempt to divert attention from its mistakes, the British Government had sought in its final submission to discredit the commission. He said it had accused the royal commission of Mr McClelland of bias and claimed the commission had mishandled British documents. Mr (Eames) claimed that the British submission had been written not for the royal commission but for consumption by British politicians and its major newspapers. The royal commission's final report is expected in November. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 24 Sep 85]

CSO: 5200/4301

GENERAL

MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW: UN, SDI, CHEMICAL-ARMS-FREE ZONE

LD151731 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 15 Sep 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, international affairs publicist; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, NOVOYE VREMYA observer; and Kim Antonovich Gerasimov, All-Union Radio commentator]

UN General Assembly

[Excerpt] [Gerasimov] Hello, comrades! The week that is starting promises to be one that is rich in international events. On 17 September there is the opening of the 40th anniversary session of the UN General Assembly, and on the 19th there is the start of the third round of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons. And those are only the most important events. As our listeners already know, our country will be represented at the General Assembly session by a delegation headed by Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and foreign minister. This is an anniversary session. The UN appeared after the great victory over fascism, and it was only because of that victory that it became possible to create that unique community of nations which is unprecedented in the history of mankind, a community designed to act as an effective instrument of peace on earth. So this session will, of course, be a more important occasion than usual. Nonetheless, I would take it upon myself to predict that the session will not just be a ceremonial occasion, primarily because the current tense and explosive world situation will not allow this.

The Soviet Union, as was confirmed once again at one of the recent meetings of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, will, at this General Assembly session, be making efforts to ensure that questions of ending the arms race occupy the chief place in its work. Our country recently came out with a number of businesslike, concrete initiatives the aim of which is to bring an end to the arms race on earth, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, and to prevent it from spreading into space. It is important that the UN, too, should speak out in favor of concrete action in this sphere. That is as far as our side is concerned. But what about the baggage that Washington is taking with it to the session, Radomir Georgiyevich?

[Bogdanov] Your question is a very difficult one for me, but at the same time also very easy. The difficulty of your question lies in the fact that essentially there is nothing one can say in reply. If you imagine a certain gentleman walking along the platform to his train, and if you look at the baggage he is carrying, then you will see to your amazement that the gentleman is getting into the train and not carrying anything with him -- he doesn't even have a small suitcase in his hand.

[Tsoppi] And it's a long-distance train!

9 October 1985

[Bogdanov] Quite right, it's a long-distance train. That gentleman is the United States. And I'm not exaggerating at all. You know, it is in the nature of my work that every morning I begin by reading many pages of information about the United States. And probably for the past 10 days I have been finding to my great amazement that the U.S. mass media do not even mention this major international event. This is very noteworthy; after all, the 40th anniversary of the UN has provided a wonderful occasion for summing up everything that has happened during those 40 years and, most importantly, for drawing up some sort of constructive proposals as to how we are to move forward and how we are to avoid a nuclear catastrophe.

I would ask: Why it is that the United States, which loves to mention, whether it has occasion to or not, that it was involved in the UN from its very start and that it made a colossal contribution to setting up the organization, suddenly, essentially completely ignores this extremely outstanding event in the lives of all nations.

I think that the answer to this is unequivocal: They do not have anything to say at that session. Completely different games are being played in Washington. First, I would say there is the whipping up of hatred against the Soviet Union. And second, I would say there is complete confusion -- and I am not exaggerating, this is no hyperbole -- confusion in official Washington at the events we have all lately been witnessing.

Among these major events I would name the interview by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee for the U.S. magazine TIME, his meeting with the U.S. senators, and his subsequent meeting with other figures. The point lies not in the actual form of what has taken place, but in the essence of what was said to the world. And, if you like, I can see a very great amount of symbolism in the fact that that interview was given on the eve of this outstanding event, the 40th anniversary of the UN. A program for the future was formulated. And I think that there is here a direct logic, a direct link with the baggage that the Soviet delegation is taking with it to the session that opens on 17 September.

The main problem, and this was said quite clearly in the interview, is the threat of the militarization of space. That is the number one question today that determines whether or not the arms race will continue and how world events will develop further. The Soviet Union has an answer to that question in our proposals for the peaceful use and the nonmilitarization of space. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that so far the United States, to whom that proposal is chiefly addressed, has not reacted at all and has not replied at all to it. I think that the United States is in a very difficult situation, although we have never deliberately put them in that situation, the whole logic of events has brought them to it.

[Taoppi] They are in fact at risk of finding themselves, if not in complete isolation, then almost in isolation, because world public opinion understands, after all, what goes on in the world and understands the difference between the attitudes of the Soviet Union and the U.S.

[Bogdanov] Quite right, and there is the answer as to why your question is very difficult: because there's nothing there; and why it's very easy -- for the same reason.

Arms Control

[Gerasimov] Strobe Talbott, the author of the book "Deadly Gambits," which was published in the United States, wrote that Reagan and his administration came to power with essentially no desire at all to pursue a course of establishing arms control. Talbott is of the opinion that the administration did not agree to the talks voluntarily. Washington, he thinks, was compelled to go into the talks under the influence of

world public opinion, the attitude of the Western European countries, and the demands of the U.S. public. And so it turns out that Washington's behavior is now shaped by two factors: The unwillingness to hold talks and the impossibility of rejecting them. That is the formulation. What do you think: Does it reflect the U.S. attitude?

[Bogdanov] I have known Strobe Talbott for many years. I must say that I have great respect for this U.S. journalist. Strobe Talbott is considered in the very widest U.S. and European circles as an established authority on problems of disarmament and arms control. That book is an extremely interesting one. It is interesting for its style, and I think it reveals very accurately the mechanism of how the Reagan administration operated during its first term. Everything you said and what you thought of the book -- it all corresponds to reality.

And there is another thing I would like to draw your attention to. Over the past few months we have issued a whole number of outstanding -- in my view -- proposals that are aimed, if not at breaking off the upward line in the arms race, then at least at creating the foundations for ending it. I am speaking about a whole system of our proposals, the system of moratoriums. We have extended our hand to the United States, and what have we received in reply? Hatred is being whipped up against us, and everything is being done to poison the atmosphere prior to the talks. The reason for this is domestic political needs, but this sounds unconvincing and even laughable. So I think that the answer is unequivocal. You asked me what I thought about it, and, unfortunately, I have a very low opinion of it.

Strategic Defense Initiative

[Tsoppf] Yes, and you and I are not the only ones who take a dim view of this. There are few people left in the world today who are -- how should I describe them -- such political simpletons as to be influenced by that same old Washington tune you mentioned, whereby war in space and war from space, in particular, against earth will bring progress, peace, and splendor to the whole of the human race. In the United States itself major authorities, in a well-argued, convincing, and firm manner -- I stress the word firm, comrades -- today in an increasingly firm manner pointing out the monstrous super-threat of Reagan's pseudodefense initiative. And in solidarity with them are people of science in other Western countries, too, which is why a broad movement among the public of all the Western countries is growing so powerfully against the "star ward" plan.

There is also another level of opposition to American blackmail and the American pretensions to global, and today cosmic, domination. This is at the state level. As we recall, France replied "leave us out" to the invitation to collective stellar suicide. The Canadian Government just recently refused to participate in "star wars". A number of other Western governments are not for the time being allowing themselves to be seduced although Britain, for example, or the British Government, I should say, hurled itself headlong into the American trap laid for it not just weekly, but with some sort of self-sacrificing and incomprehensible ecstasy, and having taken no account of British public opinion.

We all recall that West Germany latched onto the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] with equal haste. It now turns out, however, that things are not quite so straightforward even there. FRG Minister of Research and Technology Riesenhuber recently wholly competently declared that the SDI could not be justified from the point of view of research for civilian purposes. And his point of view was taken quite seriously in Bonn. As the British FINANCIAL TIMES Bonn correspondent wrote, even Foreign Minister Genscher himself is today concerned that an antimissile system deployed in space could wreck the balance of deterrence between East and West, and also disunite the United States and Western Europe. This is an interesting observation: In twisting the arms of the Western European states to get them to join in its militarist plans, Washington is alienating them.

[Gerasimov] I think this is indeed the case. But I should like to touch on a different aspect. I am continually tormented by the thought: Who benefits from this? Various figures are given for profits which could accrue to the military corporations for participation in "star wars." The figure for the first 3 years, I think, is set at 28 billion; then there is talk of 500 billion, and 1 billion dollars. The figures are just gigantic. But I do not want even to discuss how much will go into the pockets of which sector of the military-industrial complex of the United States or other Western countries; I should like to say a few words about the moral aspect of participation in "star wars" plans by the corporations. One can approach the problem, of course, from the point of view that conscience is a nonmaterial category which cannot be put into the bank; whereas participation in the militarization of space promises truly gigantic profits. And for the sake of profit, capital is known to be game for any transgression. From time immemorial, despite all its sanctimoniousness, despite its hypocritical adherence to Christian commandments -- thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, and so on, capital has killed, stolen and betrayed to the utmost. Its amorality was justified, in its own eyes at least, by the profits. And this same line of conduct is being pursued now, too, by inertia. But the present is the nuclear age, and whereas before monopoly's pursuit of profit did not, despite all its amorality, threaten mankind with final catastrophe, now it does. In the nuclear age, such thinking based upon the principle of profit at any price becomes suicidal. And it is highly notable that our country, which was from its very formation accused by the bourgeois world of lacking moral principles due to the godlessness of communists, our country is the one occupying a truly lofty moral position in heading the struggle for the peaceful future of mankind.

Gorbachev-Rau Meeting

[Tsoppi] To return to the topic of the Soviet peace offensive we were talking about, I should like to comment on another event which took place last week. I have in mind the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with Johannes Rau, an extremely prominent West German politician, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party (SDP) of Germany and premier of North Rhine-Westphalia.

It is well-known that in the modern world communists and social democrats are far from always unanimous in everything. And so it is all the more important that at the meeting I am referring to it was stated that the leading representatives of the CPSU and SDP have a common understanding of the necessity to act vigorously and persistently for the sake of peace, relaxation of tension, and constructive cooperation in order to prevent the slide toward disaster.

At this meeting the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee underlined that our plans are plans of peaceful construction, and that we need peace to implement them. His words about our proposals on curtailing the race in all types of arms that are already on the negotiating table sounded very convincing. And if the relevant states, first and foremost of the United States, have the desire to come to an agreement on all these issues which affect the destinies of entire people, then this can be done effectively and without delay.

It was pointed out that the Soviet Union has in recent years put forward a whole range of proposals -- we have just been talking about this -- and an organic part of this range of proposals is of course Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement at his meeting with Johannes Rau to the effect that in the event of the establishment of a chemical weapon-free zone in central Europe, the Soviet Union, following its fundamental foreign policy principles, would be ready to guarantee and respect the status of this zone. Such a guarantee would come into force if the United States of America would on its part act in a like manner.

GENERAL

PRAVDA EXAMINES TASKS FACING 40TH UNGA SESSION

PH161430 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Cooperation, Not Confrontation"]

[Excerpts] The 40th UN General Assembly session opens 17 September. At present this practically universal international organization has 195 member-states--socialist, developing, and capitalist, large and small. The session offers broad opportunities for states to outline their stances on major international problems, for meetings and exchanges of opinions between their representatives, and for the elaboration of decisions which, even though they are only recommendations, possess great moral and political authority. The weight of these decisions, and also of each country's contribution to the United Nations' activity, is determined primarily by the extent to which they meet the requirements of the preservation of peace and the consolidation of universal security.

The active participation by states in the session's work reflects the fact that most of them recognize the urgency and importance of the tasks facing the United Nations. It is well-known that the organization was founded 40 years ago as a result of the peoples' victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism in World War II. Its Charter, of which our country was one of the authors, enshrines the obligations of states to live in peace with one another as good neighbors and to unite in the struggle against the danger of war. Thus, the concept of peaceful coexistence put forward by V.I. Lenin forms the foundation of the United Nations. Under today's conditions, when mankind has entered the nuclear and space age, peaceful coexistence is the only sensible alternative to the nuclear catastrophe threatening all countries and peoples.

Today, as in the period of the struggle against fascism, awareness of the common danger must prompt states to rise above political and ideological differences and to unite for the sake of delivering present and future generations from the calamities of war. This is the main objective of the United Nations. Guided by this objective, the UN General Assembly at its recent sessions adopted such important documents as the declaration condemning nuclear war and the resolutions on preventing an arms race in outer space and on freezing nuclear weapons. These decisions, which only the United States and its closest allies voted against, graphically displayed the views of the world community of states on the urgent issues of curbing the arms race and preserving peace.

There are, however, forces that are prepared, for the sake of their narrowly self-seeking interests, to subject mankind to deadly danger. It is through their fault that the 40th UN General Assembly session is meeting in a complex, tense, and, one may even say, explosive international situation. And the situation is tending to deteriorate even further. Aggressive imperialist circles, and primarily the United States, continue to rely on strength, create and test more and more new nuclear -- and now also space -- weapons, and resort to methods of state terrorism with regard to other countries and peoples.

The watershed in contemporary world politics lies between realism, responsibility, and real concern for mankind's fate on the one hand, and the adventurism of militarist forces pushing the planet toward the nuclear abyss on the other hand.

The approach by states toward the objectives, principles, and activity of the United Nations accurately demonstrates the essence of their political course.

The Soviet Union's approach toward the 40th session stems from its peace-loving foreign policy. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has confirmed that the USSR attaches great importance to the United Nations as an effective instrument of peace and will continue to strive to ensure that the fair democratic principles on which this organization was founded are embodied in the practice of international relations. The jubilee UN session is called upon to make a tangible contribution to the revival of detente, to ensuring a turn for the better in world affairs. The socialist community countries cohesively advocate this. This is also the common desire of the nonaligned and also a number of developed capitalist countries, which are experiencing growing concern over the situation in the world. Convincing evidence of this is provided by the Delhi declaration by the leaders of six countries from four continents -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden. It speaks of the need to take "specific steps aimed at eliminating the threat to mankind's very continued existence" in the year of the United Nations' 40th anniversary.

The main thing now is to secure an end to the arms race on earth and prevent it from spreading into space. The Soviet Union's proposal that the question "on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space under conditions of its nonmilitarization" be included in the session's agenda helps focus the attention and efforts of UN member-states on the solution of this paramount task. The Soviet initiative embodies a new political thinking which accords with the realities of the nuclear and space age. It proceeds from the premise that the process of the exploration of space must not suffer the fate of mankind's other very great scientific and technical achievement -- the mastering of nuclear energy. It must not be made to serve the creation of a new category of weapons, but rather must be used for the development of broad international cooperation and the solution of the scientific, technical, and economic tasks facing each country and each people.

"Star peace" instead of "star wars" -- this is the only choice worthy of the space era of people on earth. And it is the Soviet Union's conviction that the United Nations must proclaim this precisely and clearly in the year of its 40th anniversary.

A total end to nuclear weapons tests would be exceptionally important for the easing of tension in the world. The nuclear arms race would be halted in the most dangerous direction -- the qualitative direction. A serious contribution would also be made toward strengthening the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. On the Soviet Union's initiative, all this has been repeatedly advocated by the United Nations, reflecting the international community's will.

Convincingly demonstrating unity of words and deeds, the USSR recently took another bold step in this direction. As of 6 August, it introduced unilaterally a moratorium on all nuclear explosions which will remain in force even after 1 January 1986 if the United States joins it. This would set a good example for other states possessing nuclear weapons. What the USSR offers is a real opportunity to halt the buildup and switch to the reduction of nuclear arsenals, which would accord with the interests of all states. Here, as in the other directions of curbing and terminating the arms race, it is necessary to act quickly, otherwise the time may slip by and the opportunity will be missed. This is why international circles learned with such amazement and indignation that in response to the Soviet moratorium, the U.S. Administration hastened to carry out yet another nuclear explosion, while its response to the proposal on peaceful use of space was the decision to conduct the first combat test of antisatellite weapons.

Under these circumstances it is necessary for the UN General Assembly session to lend new impetus to the solution of the questions of the prevention of an arms race in space and the banning of all nuclear weapon tests, the rejection by all nuclear powers, following the example of the USSR and PRC, of the first use of such weapons, the freezing of nuclear arsenals, and the start of talks on their reduction.

In the year of its 40th anniversary, the United Nations is called upon to augment its efforts aimed at eliminating the material means of waging nuclear and other wars. The prohibition of such barbaric mass destruction weapons as chemical weapons is an urgent matter. The plans announced in the United States for the creation of a new variety of chemical weapons, binary weapons, for deployment in Western Europe and other regions raise most urgently the task of preventing the spread of "silent death" across the planet. The time has also come to take effective measures for the limitation and non-proliferation of so-called conventional weapons, because the latest types are not far behind weapons of mass destruction in terms of their destructive power.

Important tasks face the forthcoming session with regard to strengthening the political and international law foundations of security. Their solution must be furthered by an examination of the question of implementing the declaration on the strengthening of international security adopted by the United Nations at the USSR's initiative in 1970. The jubilee meeting in Helsinki confirmed that for 10 years now the Final Act of the all-European conference has been effectively helping implementation of the United Nations' objectives in Europe. A comprehensive approach is also needed toward the problem of security in Asia.

It is necessary for the General Assembly to mark the United Nations' 40th anniversary by also making politically significant decisions on improving international economic relations and on strengthening confidence between states and their security in this sphere.

It is also in the interests of absolutely everyone to develop cooperation in such a direction of the organization's activity as the promotion of the peoples' socio-economic progress. All states are losers as a result of the fact that these tasks remain unresolved and, conversely, they will all gain under conditions of peace, cooperation, and equal security.

The United Nations' objectives and principles and the General Assembly's decisions adopted in accord with them are the exact opposite of the "position-of-strength" policy, confrontation, and the desire for military superiority. The imperialist forces will not succeed in erasing the noble UN ideals. The experience of history

testifies that whenever states have displayed readiness to determine their policy in accordance with these ideals, international security and mutually advantageous cooperation have strengthened and the organization itself has functioned more effectively.

The people look to the United Nations with hope, and are fully justified in demanding that the organization's member-states, including those at the forthcoming session, resolutely opt for cooperation instead of confrontation, muster their political courage, halt the terrifying process that is developing, put an end to the arms race, and embark on disarmament and the improvement of relations while there is still time.

As regards the Soviet Union, at the forthcoming UN General Assembly session it will be guided by the promise that the only sensible way out in our time is to organize active cooperation between all states for the sake of a common peaceful future.

CSO: 5200/1002

GENERAL

TASS REPORTS UN SPEECHES ON DISARMAMENT, SPACE WEAPONS

LD250718 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 25 Sep 85

[Text] New York, September 25 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Sergey Baybakov, Arkadiy Sidoruk, Vyacheslav Chernyshev and Gennadiy Shishkin report:

The issues of improving the international situation, ending the arms race on earth and keeping it out of space are in the focus of attention in a general political debate which is under way at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Speaking there, President Julio Sanguinetti of Uruguay pointed out the madness of the arms race which threatened to spread to outer space. He called for releasing the huge funds now squandered on building destructive weapons to be used for constructive purposes, in the interests of millions of people.

Paavo Vayrynen, deputy prime minister and foreign minister of Finland, said, for his part, that outer space must be used only for peaceful purposes to the benefit of all mankind. In this connection he urged strict compliance with the officially proclaimed objective of Soviet-American talks in Geneva, which is to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space, terminating the arms drive on earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms. Paavo Vayrynen also stressed the importance of strengthening universal security and eliminating the risk of outbreak of military conflicts in accordance with the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Swedish Foreign Minister Lennart Bodstrom said outer space was a common property of humanity and its peaceful use was extremely important to all states. The problem of precluding an arms race in space had of late riveted extensive attention and the Swedish Government believed, he emphasized, that the security of states could not be ensured by deploying military systems in space.

Deputy Prime Minister Geoffrey Palmer of New Zealand said his country would not allow nuclear weapons deployments in its territory or visits by ships with nuclear weapons aboard to its ports. He called for making the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone and demanded an end to all nuclear weapons testing there.

Foreign Minister Karolos Papoulias of Greece said the Greek Government was convinced that international security could not be achieved in conditions where armed interventions took place, a position of strength policy was pursued and acts of aggression were perpetrated. He urged the fostering of a climate of trust in state-to-state relations in the interests of enhancing international security and solving the problem of disarmament. First of all nuclear disarmament. The Greek representative voiced backing for the idea of turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and U.N. efforts to solve the Cypriot problem through ensuring the territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus.

The General Assembly's full-scale meeting Tuesday was also addressed by Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe, Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen, Icelandic Foreign Minister Geir Hallgrímsson and Jacques Poos, deputy prime minister and foreign minister of Luxembourg.

CSO: 5200/1015

GENERAL

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW ON DETENTE, ARMS ISSUES

PM161417 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] To Parry the Threat of War

Broad circles of the world public have perceived the replies of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the American TIME magazine as evidence of the political goodwill and the determination of the Soviet Union to do everything to parry the threat of war and to direct the development of the international situation into the channel of detente, and relations between states with different social systems onto the path of equitable mutually advantageous peaceful cooperation. Last week politicians, public figures, and the press of the whole world continued with unabated interest a lively discussion of this exceptionally important political document, which reflects the consistent peace-loving foreign policy course of the Land of the Soviets.

This attention to and interest in the interview are understandable. Conscious of its responsibility for the fate of peace on earth, the Soviet Union displays a bold, principled, constructive approach to cardinal problems of world politics and persistently advocates ending the accumulation of nuclear arsenals, curbing military rivalry, strengthening confidence and international cooperation, and, in particular, normalizing Soviet-American relations.

Precisely this aim -- to break the vicious circle of the arms race and extricate the arms limitation process from the impasse -- is pursued, in particular, by the USSR's decision to unilaterally cease all nuclear explosions and not resume them after 1 January 1986 if the United States acts likewise, as well as by the proposals on peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space. The Soviet Union is resolutely opposed to preparations for "star wars." It offers the international community a different prospect -- broad cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of space under conditions of its nonmilitarization.

Europe can and must play a substantial and indispensable role in the cause of a return to detente and to resolving key security problems. As was pointed out during the 10 September talks between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and J. Rau, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and prime minister of the Land of North Rhine-Westphalia (FRG), the Soviet Union has advanced a whole range of proposals aimed at radically improving the situation on the continent and raising the level of mutual security. The USSR advocates freeing the continent from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.

In the event of the creation in Central Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons, the USSR would be prepared to guarantee and respect the status of that zone. This guarantee would come into effect if the United States acted likewise. The world public, including the American public, evaluates highly the constructive Soviet initiatives. A recent U.S. poll showed that 57 percent of those polled absolutely advocated that the United States should follow the USSR's example, and 63 percent declared that a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions will significantly reduce the threat of nuclear war being unleashed.

"I considered it important to write to you and express gratitude for the moratorium on nuclear tests announced by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary," stated a letter to the editors from U.S. citizen Eric (Muller) of the city of Austin, Texas. "There cannot be clearer proof of the USSR's sincere desire for disarmament and peace. At the same time, words cannot express my indignation at Washington's reaction to this noble unilateral step toward peace. Instead of agreeing to a mutual halt to nuclear tests, the U.S. Administration essentially wants the Soviet Union to consent to the buildup of the American nuclear arsenal, which can already be described as insane." A statement, signed by 24 well-known American politicians and 12 major U.S. public organizations was disseminated at a Washington press conference this week, contains an appeal to the U.S. and USSR leaders to confirm their allegiance to the already existing strategic arms limitation treaties and the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and to arrive at an agreement to introduce a mutual moratorium on tests of antisatellite weapons and to cease nuclear tests. The document points out that an accord on one or several points on this agenda would make an important contribution to the cause of reducing the risk of nuclear war breaking out.

Sharp criticism and misgivings are aroused in U.S. political, public, and scientific circles by the test just conducted at a real target in space. Despite the fact that the pledge unilaterally adopted by the Soviet Union not to put antisatellite systems into space has now been in effect for two years, Washington has thus taken one more practical step along the path of escalating the arms race and toward spreading it into space; a step which can only lead to increased international tension.

Citing an official administration spokesman, THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that the White House regards this test as "a show of American determination on the eve of the summit meeting." In other words, a show of strength, a means of pressure. Some people in Washington evidently believe that if the USSR is opposed to the militarization of space, it is "afraid" and must be "pressured." But this is a dangerous illusion. The gentlemen on the other side of the ocean evidently forget that they are dealing with the Soviet Union and that such "strong-arm" methods and calculations are known to be doomed to failure.

A different approach and a serious, constructive attitude to the matter are promising and necessary in world affairs now. This is precisely why the U.S. public turns again and again to M.S. Gorbachev's replies to TIME magazine and to his talk with U.S. senators.

But this is plainly not the official Washington's line. Washington's negative stance appears in too undesirable a light against the background of the Soviet initiatives. This is why additional efforts have been made there in recent days to strike a campaign hostile to the Soviet Union and designed to justify the aggressive U.S. foreign policy course.

In an interview on the U.S. college radio station network, the head of the White House painted a deliberately distorted picture of the foreign policy actions, as well as the entire policy, of the Soviet Union, groundlessly accusing it of "expansionism." The same aim was pursued by Vice President G. Bush's lecture in Kansas on the upcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. Even though Bush admitted verbally that the policy of confrontation "is neither sensible nor realistic," his further statements showed that the United States still does not want to meet practical Soviet proposals and displays an immutably confrontationalist approach.

It is characteristic that the vice president said not a word either about the USSR's unilateral moratorium on the launching of antisatellite weapons into space, or about the moratorium unilaterally introduced by our country on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the suspension of the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe, or about the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. G. Bush sought to substitute an opposite reply to the Soviet foreign policy initiatives with accusations of all the mortal sins against the USSR, from unsubstantiated allegations that the Soviet Union has unleashed a new round in the arms race to unceremonious lectures on how it should behave in the human rights sphere. One wonders why all this was necessary. Does it indicate a desire to create an atmosphere of trust or a sincere, businesslike approach to the summit meeting in Geneva?

CBU: 5200/1002

GENERAL

MOSCOW: U.S. OBSTRUCTS DISARMAMENT WITH PROPAGANDA CLAIMS

0W150305 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress to China 0400 GMT 14 Sep 85

[Text] Dear listeners: The proponents of the theory of the rivalry between the two superpowers have been actively peddling to the world public that the Soviet Union and the United States should be held responsible for intensifying the arms race. In reality, however, there has been an increasing amount of persuasive facts proving that, as far as arms race is concerned, the Soviet stand is diametrically opposed to that of the United States. While the Soviet Union has been persistently doing its utmost to stop the arms race, the United States has been doing all it can to obstruct the realization of all disarmament measures.

In this connection, please listen to a commentary by Ivanov, an observer of international political issues:

In an interview with TIME magazine, Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, very clearly elaborated the Soviet stand on disarmament and USSR-U.S. relations. To break the deadlock in the course of limiting the arms race, the USSR has declared a moratorium on nuclear tests and urged the United States to do the same and resume the negotiations for a complete ban on nuclear weapons. The proposals regarding peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space are also meant to achieve this objective.

What is Washington's response to the Soviet Union's specific and clear-cut proposals? Washington says these proposals are nothing but propaganda. Anyone with a little knowledge of the crux of the matter can easily see that the Soviet proposals are based on serious intentions and are not claptrap to win public applause.

Incidentally, the proponents of the superpower theory have also loudly echoed the U.S. claim that the Soviet proposals are nothing but propaganda. On 9 September, for example, the official radio of a major Asian country broadcast a commentary on international affairs. Entitled "Elusive Soviet-U.S. Relations," the commentary tried its utmost to describe the principled struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States as a propaganda war, saying that both countries want to deceive the other in an attempt to achieve military superiority.

The perpetrator should be held responsible for such a fabrication. The world public has not regarded the USSR's constructive proposals as a propaganda gimmick. The people of many countries, including the United States, welcome and endorse the specific measures the USSR has adopted to ease the arms race.

People of all circles would like to ask: Why does not the United States also reciprocate the Soviet Union's peace-loving appeal with a so-called propaganda gimmick? The answer is that influential cliques in the United States have no intention whatsoever of stopping the arms race from which they can reap huge windfalls, achieve military superiority around the world, and achieve their fond dream of eliminating the socialist system.

Utterly preposterous was what Reagan, the incumbent U.S. President who is deadset on serving these cliques, said a few days ago to vilify the USSR's peace-loving stand. He said: Even Lenin, the world renowned internationalist and author of the Peace Declaration, had a plan for seeking hegemony.

All this shows that Washington neither intends to take positive measures to respond to the USSR's disarmament proposals, nor does it want disarmament.

CSU: 5200/1002

9 October 1985

GENERAL

USSR WEEKLY VIEWS SIPRI'S WORK ON ARMS CONTROL

PMO30951 Moscow NOVYE VREMYA in Russian No 34, 16 Aug 85 pp 14-15

[Article by correspondent V. Pavlov: "Sweden: SIPRI: The Institute in Bergshamra"]

[Text] Stockholm--A modest two-story building in Bergshamra, a quiet Stockholm suburb. This is the location of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). It is well known, both within Sweden and abroad. SIPRI is considered in the West to be one of the most authoritative scientific centers engaged in collecting and analyzing information on problems of the strategic balance, the arms race, and disarmament.

The idea of creating SIPRI was that of former Swedish Prime Minister T. Erlander, who did much to strengthen the traditional policy of neutrality. In 1964, when the 150th anniversary of Sweden's nonparticipation in wars was being widely marked in the country, T. Erlander proposed the creation of an institute which would work to find ways for the peaceful solution of international conflicts and the strengthening of stable world peace.

SIPRI was formed organizationally in 1966. Its activity is financed almost entirely by the Swedish Parliament. The main areas of the institute's work are determined by its eight-man administrative council. The council chairman is R. Björnerstedt, a Swede, and former assistant secretary general of the United Nations. Scientific research is under the direct leadership of the institute's director F. Blackaby, an Englishman. Scientists from 11 countries are working at SIPRI at present. The council members and the institute's director are appointed by the Swedish Government from a number of specialists from various countries excluding the United States and the USSR. Thereby emphasizing its independence on the policy of the great powers is emphasized.

During its existence SIPRI has published dozens of books and scientific reports on various aspects of the arms race, the worldwide weapons trade, and international talks on arms limitation and disarmament. In view of the generally conscientious and objective approach of the institute's staffers to research problems, SIPRI's publications and the figures cited in them are widely used by experts from the United Nations and other international organizations, and politicians, public figures, scientists, and journalists from different countries.

It must be noted, however, that the authors of certain works, trying to determine the causes of the arms race, clearly seek to lay equal responsibility on the United States and the Soviet Union or, at best, discreetly avoid answering this question. This approach to a certain extent also distinguishes the recently published latest anthology of articles entitled "Arms and Disarmament in the World," widely known among specialists as the SIPRI yearbook.

In these notes I should like to touch on certain problems raised in the anthology. Analyzing the present-day international situation, the compilers of the yearbook justly note that the main destabilizing factors are the arms race and the development of new military technologies. They point with alarm to the trend toward an annual increase in the rate of military spending and the growth of appropriations on scientific research and experimental design work in the military sphere. In 1984 alone they increased by over 10 percent. This means that in the next few years new types of weapons will appear which will destabilize the situation even further. The figures cited in the yearbook show that the main role in fueling a new round in the arms race was played by the United States, which increased the Pentagon's appropriations by 40 percent in the past 4 years. The yearbook emphasizes the exceptional importance of the Soviet-U.S. space and nuclear arms talks now being held in Geneva. The improvement of relations between the two great powers and consequently the reduction of international tension are possible, the research says, only in the event of progress at those talks.

SIPRI's experts assess the U.S. "strategic defense initiative" negatively. They believe that its implementation will inevitably undermine the 1972 ABM limitation treaty, which is an important element of the nuclear arms limitation process. Nevertheless, SIPRI's assessment of the situation which has arisen at the Geneva talks is virtually restricted to a simple statement of the sides' positions: The United States, it says, believes it possible to conclude an agreement on just one of the questions under discussion while the USSR insists on an all-embracing treaty covering space weapons, strategic armaments, and medium-range nuclear weapons. There is no mention of who is to blame for the fact that the Geneva talks are deadlocked.

The anthology "Arms and Disarmament in the World" pays great attention to the massive deployment of SLCM's. According to SIPRI's figures, in the next few years the U.S. Navy will be armed with around 4,000 Tomahawk missiles. It will also be armed with 4 battleships, 29 cruisers, 51 destroyers, and 100 submarines.

The institute's experts point out with good reason that cruise missiles' high accuracy and potential for deployment in forward-based regions and the high yield of warheads seriously destabilizes the military-strategic situation and increases the risk of the unleashing of nuclear war. Furthermore, the complexity of monitoring the deployment of SLCM's will lead to extra difficulties at the Geneva talks.

The correct conclusions have been drawn. However, SIPRI's specialists "forget" to say that the present situation arose exclusively through the fault of the United States. After all, it was the United States which threw out

the SALT-2 protocol, according to which long-range cruise missiles are to be limited if not banned. At the Geneva talks the United States is avoiding adopting the Soviet proposal on a mutual ban on this dangerous new type of strategic armament, stating in general terms that it is ready to limit somewhat only GLCM's.

Nevertheless, despite its flaw, the wealth of statistical material collected in the yearbook and the analysis of present trends in the arms and disarmament sphere make it possible to better understand and to a certain extent evaluate anew both the potential existing now for ensuring a stable peace and the serious difficulties and obstacles in the way of achieving that goal.

The Institute's activity is not limited to publishing yearbooks and scientific works. Its specialists take active part as experts in the work of various international organizations. SIPRI holds conferences, symposiums, and seminars on the most topical questions of international security.

Great interest was aroused, for example, by the conference on the theme "Space Arms and International Security", organized on SIPRI's initiative and held 5-7 July in Saltsjöbaden, near the Swedish capital. Well known scientists, politicians, and public figures from 15 countries, including the United States, the USSR, the PRC, India, the GDR, Hungary, France, and the FRG, took part in the work of that representative international forum.

When opening the conference Birgitta Dahl, energy minister at the Swedish industry ministry, pointed out that those taking part in the forum had gathered at a decisive moment for mankind while a unique opportunity still perhaps exists to prevent the spread of the arms race to space, which would undermine the whole international security system. Those who hope to use scientific and technical achievements to ensure greater security for themselves are dangerously mistaken. Real security can only be achieved by cooperation with the other side, not at its expense.

B. Dahl noted that the forum's work includes representatives of a number of countries which do not have a space technology of their own. That is reasonable: After all, the threat from space affects all countries and peoples and, therefore, its elimination is also a task for all states.

The speech by T. Gaffney, a leading staffer at the U.S. Defense Department, struck a note of sharp discord. Essentially avoiding discussion of the dangerous consequences of militarizing space, he set about justifying the U.S. administration's "strategic defense initiative" by using jumbled figures to claim that the USSR is outstripping the United States in this sphere. At the same time he tried, despite the facts, to assert that the implementation of Reagan's plans will not be in breach of the ABM Treaty. This sounded particularly strange coming from Gaffney, since his immediate boss--U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger--has directly stated on this score that "at the present stage we are conducting research work aimed at determining whether it is possible to create a perfectly reliable system. If so we shall have to go beyond the framework of the ABM Treaty."

During the conference a televised discussion by means of communication satellite was organized involving the specialists present in Stockholm and well known experts in Moscow and Washington. (L. Floss), leader of the Pentagon's nuclear policy research group, and M. Eisenstein, a staffer of the well known Rand Corporation, went all out to prove that the "star wars" program will have a stabilizing effect on the strategic balance of forces and will reduce the danger of nuclear weapons being used.

Academician YE.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who headed the Soviet delegation at the Saltsjebaden conference, pointed out the utter groundlessness of such an "argument." The notorious SDI, he stated, is one of the most important elements of the creation of a first-strike potential. Implementing the program will spur on a new round in the arms race and the appearance of even more dangerous types of weapons. The main condition for achieving a significant reduction in nuclear arms on the basis of the principle of equality and ideological security, YE.P. Velikhov stressed, is to prevent an arms race in space and observe the ABM treaty.

Not all the U.S. representatives taking part in the conference supported the "star wars" program. Former U.S. Defense Secretary R. Macnamara, for example, noted in his speech that he understands the Soviet Union's concern at the wide-ranging ABM system with space-based elements being created in the United States, which may in fact be used to deliver the first strike. In his opinion, relations between the USSR and the United States should be governed by political means, not by unilateral measures of a military-technical character. Other participants in the conference were also sharply critical of the U.S. program for the militarization of space.

Documents adopted at the working group session emphasize the need for the observance of all the provisions of the 1972 ABM Treaty, which is the basis of the whole process of arms limitation and of maintaining strategic stability. They point out that despite all the scientific and technical achievements since 1972, the military-political considerations which led to the conclusion of the treaty, including those concerning the organic link between offensive and defensive weapons, retain their full force and significance to this day.

The conference delegates expressed the common view that at the Soviet-U.S. space and nuclear arms talks in Geneva the sides must adhere strictly to the subject and aims of the talks as agreed in January 1985.

6301 5200/1002

GENERAL

SOVIET SCIENTISTS PUBLISH BOOK ON NUCLEAR WAR EFFECTS

LD131744 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 13 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow September 13 TASS--The "Mir" publishers have issued the book "The Night After" prepared by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defence of Peace, Against the Nuclear Threat. The authors of the book, which has the subtitle "Climatic and Biological Consequences of a Nuclear War, Scientists Warn", are prominent Soviet scientists and public figures.

The foreword, written by Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defence of Peace, scientist of world fame in the field of nuclear physics and plasma physics, formulates the goals and tasks of the book as follows: "Our underlying assumption is that scientists can and moreover must influence the course of political events, because no one is better to perceive and project the tragic consequences of a nuclear conflict..."

We proceed from the assumption that "a nuclear war would be the last epidemic in human history, for which no antidote exists other than its prevention."

The monograph consists of two parts. In the first part the scientists express their view on the atmospheric, climatic and ecological consequences of nuclear war on human organism from the medical point of view.

The second part contains excerpts from speeches of Soviet scientists at the all-union conference "To Save the World from the Threat of Nuclear War and to Ensure Disarmament and Peace," which was held in Moscow in 1983. Appeals by scientists from various countries and other documents related to the struggle to preserve peace have been published in a special appendix.

The book, which has already been translated into English, is illustrated with the canvases "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" by Albrecht Dürer and "Summer" by Russian artist of the 19th century Aleksey Venetskiy.

CSO: 5200/1002

GENERAL

MOSCOW TV HITS PENTAGON REPORT ON NUCLEAR WINTER, SDI

LD070553 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1946 GMT 6 Sep 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Igor Fessenko--announcer-read report]

[Text] The impression produced on the American public by the latest statements of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, concerning the Soviet-American relations and the necessity to slow down the arms race on earth and to prevent it from being shifted to space, appears to be so strong that Washington is feverishly looking for some kind of counterarguments. Apparently, the report which has just been prepared on the Pentagon's order on the subject of "significance of the Nuclear Winter Theory," has come as a result of such hectic activities. The essence of this document can be expressed by the following: It appears that the terrifying consequences of a global thermonuclear conflict can be avoided not through banning the nuclear weapons, but through deployment of the new so-called "strategic defense systems." In order to prevent earth from being consumed in the conflagration of a nuclear war, it is necessary, it appears, not to curtail the arms race, not to stop testing nuclear weapons, but on the contrary, to modernize American nuclear and conventional arms. The Pentagon, which has ordered this, as to speak "research," of the ostensibly independent Palmer Corporation, is washing its hands off with satisfaction in the hope that some simpletons can be found who will believe this propaganda forgery.

CSO: 5280/1015

GENERAL

TASS ANALYST CRITICIZES MCFARLANE SPEECH

LD171626 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 17 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 17 TASS--By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

Robert McFarlane, assistant to the president for national security affairs, speaking in Washington, has declared that the United States is looking forward to the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting and that the U.S. "President has committed himself to meet the Soviet Union halfway in developing possible solutions to outstanding problems."

So, one might expect, a serious, fruitful dialogue will take place in Geneva. But that is not so: The President's adviser is overwhelmed with doubts and suspicions about "the Soviet side of the ledger." Will Moscow advance new ideas, concrete proposals, will it display genuine interest in resolving the outstanding problems? McFarlane asks. The United States hopes to hear concrete Soviet proposals at Geneva, Vienna and Stockholm, he adds.

What a strange assertion. It is well known that at the Geneva talks, to be resumed on September 19, the Soviet Union consistently and persistently presses for banning strike space weapons and radically cutting nuclear arsenals, including medium-range weapons.

The principled constructive and concrete Soviet proposals to this effect are being commented worldwide -- doesn't Mr McFarlane know about them?

Just as well known are the Soviet initiatives directed at reducing the numerical strength of troops and armaments in central Europe. The essence of these initiatives, aimed at breaking the deadlock at the Vienna talks, dragging on through the West's fault, is to reduce the strength of the land forces of the USSR and the United States and work out detailed verification measures. What are then the "concrete proposals" that Mr McFarlane expects?

Now about Stockholm. The Soviet Union's stance is no secret. The Soviet Union, other socialist countries favour radical measures for building confidence, reaching an agreement on non-first use of nuclear weapons, on non-use of force in relations between states.

Does it not show the USSR's genuine, rather than hypocritical, interest in resolving acute international problems? Can one believe that Mr McFarlane knows nothing about these Soviet initiatives either?

Displaying the striking "lack of information" on the USSR's stand on major problems, discussed at international problems [as received], the presidential adviser publicises in all ways the U.S. own stance: Washington, he claims, is ready to meet the summit partner more than halfway. However, using Mr McFarland's political lexicon, one may ask the following question: What "new ideas" and "concrete proposals" has the Washington administration advanced in the run-up to the Soviet-American summit meeting?

The President's national security adviser does not show any desire to give a concrete -- precisely concrete -- analysis of Washington's policies, talking in general terms about U.S. commitment to peace and arms control.

There is what to mention here. For instance, in response to the Soviet Union's call for non-militarization of outer space, the United States proclaims its determination to go ahead with the "star wars" project and demonstratively conducts a test of an anti-satellite (ASAT) system.

In response to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear weapon tests, the United States detonates an underground nuclear blast in Nevada. In response to the Soviet proposals for ridding Europe of nuclear threat, the United States is rapidly turning West Germany and other Western European countries into a staging area for making a first nuclear strike against the USSR.

A spokesman for the American Air Force command recently announced at a press conference in Ramstein, West Germany, that 96 American cruise missiles will be deployed in the Federal Republic in addition to Pershings, starting from 1987.

McFarland calls for a policy based on realism, and this declaration can only be welcomed. Realism in politics, however, provides for a serious business-like and concrete response to the constructive initiatives and proposals by the other side, rather than a deliberate omission or distortion of these proposals for propaganda purposes. And realism, of course, provides for renouncing the banking on force, the banking that is futureless as much as it is dangerous, including for the United States.

12801 12800/12822

GENERAL

PONOMAREV RECEIVES U.S. CONGRESSMEN 24 SEPTEMBER

LD2441553 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 24 Sep 85

[Text] Moscow, September 24 TASS -- American Congressmen Edward Markey and Robert Mrazek were received in the Kremlin today by chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Boris Ponomarev. Taking part in the meeting were also deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Zhukov, Richard Kozolapov, member of the Collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry, Ambassadors Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, chief of a General Staff Department, Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov as well as former assistant to the President Theodore Sorensen, professor of Duke University J.P. Hough, and the well-known WASHINGTON POST news analyst Mary McCrory, who are accompanying the congressmen.

Boris Ponomarev noted the great significance of the continuing development of parliamentary contacts as one of the factors which enables one to know better the state of affairs in our countries, their foreign policy, to conduct a dialogue on topical questions and thereby promote normalization of Soviet-American relations.

This is particularly important in the present-day situation when relations between our countries remain complex, the arms race is mounting and the threat of war is not on the decline. The feverish production and build-up in the United States of all types of offensive weapons, including binary, chemical, the recent tests of the AAAF anti-satellite system and the military laser device, the resistance pushing through of the aggressive "star wars" programme irrefutably prove that. The attempts of the U.S. Administration and the official American propaganda to justify these dangerous actions by some "lugging behind" the USSR hold no water. The aim of these attempts is to mislead the public in the United States and the world over.

Motivated by the striving to uphold the primary human right to ... in peace, the USSR is doing its utmost to stop the arms race, particularly nuclear, to lead through concrete full liquidation of armaments everywhere, to prevent the arms race in every sense. This principled approach is manifest in numerous questions which are being solved by the Soviet side at the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva.

Deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet arrived in detail ... The American congressmen about practical efforts being undertaken by the Supreme Soviet and the government of the Soviet Union in consolidating peace and international security, in creating a more favorable political climate in Soviet-American relations. The American legislators' attention was drawn to the peace initiatives, which had been broadly approved

by the world public and put forward by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. These initiatives involve the Soviet Union's moratorium on any nuclear explosions, the call upon the United States to join the moratorium, to resume negotiations on complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, and also the proposal on peaceful cooperation in exploration of outer space in conditions of its non-militarization, on a zone in central Europe free from chemical weapons.

Congressmen Edward Markey and Robert Mrazek on their part expressed concern and anxiety over the precarious situation in the world and the present-day state of American-Soviet relations. They declared for the quest for efficient ways of limiting the arms race and removing the threat of a nuclear war, as well as for the preservation of the existing treaties and agreements in the area of limitation of armaments, including the ABM treaty.

In the opinion of both sides, the Soviet-American summit meeting to be held in Geneva in November is bound to become a very important event in Soviet-American relations and international life as a whole.

The meeting passed in a businesslike and frank atmosphere.

CSO: 52 0/1002

GENERAL

USSR: U.S. ARMS STANCE THREATENS STRATEGIC STABILITY

PM181545 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 37, 6 Sep 85 pp 3-4

[Article by Lev Semeyko, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace Disarmament Commission: "M.S. Gorbachev's Interview With TIME Magazine Sounded as a Serious Warning to Those Forces in Washington Which Want to Deadlock Talks With the Soviet Union. The USSR Will Not Accept Washington's Onslaught Scenario" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] Last August the world witnessed two U.S. militarist actions of wide-scale political importance. On 17 August another underground nuclear explosion, the tenth this year, was carried out in Nevada. That was the provocative action with which Washington responded to the USSR's proposal that it join the moratorium on any nuclear explosions declared by the USSR. Just 3 days later on 20 August there followed a new challenge to sanity: Another test on an antisatellite weapon, the third of the 12 that have been planned, was announced. This time the test was a qualitatively new one; for the first time it was against a target in space. Again the United States ignored the Soviet proposal that it join the moratorium on experimental launches of antisatellite weapons, a moratorium which Moscow has been observing for 2 years now. Observing, because, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, "we are persistently seeking ways of breaking the vicious circle attracting the arms limitation process from deadlock."

Official Washington tried to vindicate its refusal. But the arguments were phony.

NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS. A week before the nuclear explosion in Nevada THE NEW YORK TIMES reported that since 1945 the United States has produced 60,000 nuclear warheads of 71 types for use in 116 weapon systems. About half of this enormous arsenal is in use today. But that is not enough for the Pentagon: Before the end of the decade, it has planned to produce at least 17,000 nuclear charges, including new types and kinds. New would mean subject to preliminary tests. Hence, the reluctance to conclude a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. And a reluctance even to introduce a moratorium on these tests.

Washington's "logic," with whose aid it is now trying to wriggle out of the highly delicate political situation, is truly stunning. It could be reduced to the following more or less: What is needed is not a moratorium, but a treaty on banning nuclear tests; but the conclusion of a treaty is impossible as long as there is no reliable control over its execution. Let's look into the thrust of this mumbo jumbo.

IS A MORATORIUM NECESSARY? Undoubtedly. It is a moratorium in any field of the arms race which can create conditions for a calm and businesslike examination and solution of complex new questions. A moratorium is also the first step to the solution of the problem of banning nuclear tests. Just one confirmation: On 10 June 1963 President Kennedy declared that the United States was halting nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Not 2 months had elapsed before the treaty on banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, space, and underwater had been signed.

At the time the White House treated the problem seriously, although it did not make up its mind to undertake a universal ban on nuclear weapons tests. But where is the present administration's "logic" leading? When R. McFarlane, the President's national security adviser, was asked why the President had rejected the Soviet moratorium proposal, he replied: "Because the President wants arms control to be treated absolutely seriously." White House Press Secretary L. Speakes "went" even further on the matter of "seriousness": "Our delegation (at the Geneva talks--L.S.) has had the opportunity to display great flexibility for reaching fruitful agreements.

We call on the Russians to display just as serious an approach." Comment is superfluous.

IS CONTROL RELIABLE? Yes, it is. With the aid of a global system of seismic stations it is possible to detect all underground nuclear weapons tests. The U.S. Navy has the backbone of this system, seismic devices located in approximately 35 countries. They worked as long as 25 years ago, even though there were fewer of them at that time. In December 1961, for instance, the United States carried out the "Gnome" nuclear explosion especially to confirm the possibility of the seismic concealment of explosions. But it was registered in many countries. In early 1962, the USSR carried out its first underground nuclear explosion, which was not announced. And that explosion was registered in the United States.

Since then, the potential of national technical monitoring means (satellites, acoustic and electronic means, and others) has greatly increased. "New seismic devices measuring high-frequency signals can detect extremely low-yield nuclear explosions from far greater distances" than before, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote in early August. This is also confirmed by theoretical calculations and by practice. This has frequently been stated by very important scientists, especially at Pugwash conferences. The problem of the reliability of control is thus an artificial, not a real, problem. For Washington, it is merely a pretext and not a reason for the fact that for decades now it has been thwarting the conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

IS IT NECESSARY TO "CATCH UP WITH" THE USSR? In rejecting the Soviet proposal to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions, President Reagan alleged that the United States will study the possibility of banning tests after it has "closed the gap." Not a new method: The USSR has allegedly "forged ahead" again. Again there is a falsification confirmed by the nuclear explosions statistics. "The United States, where about 765 tests have been carried out, is confidently outstripping the USSR," Rear Admiral E. Carol (retired) writes in THE NEW YORK TIMES. "The United States has now carried out 42 percent more tests than the Soviet Union." "In reality the United States has tested more nuclear weapons than all other states taken together" -- these are extracts from a U.S. Department of Energy document.

Why then the new tests? The answer is simple: Nuclear warheads are being tested for the MX, Trident-II, Midgetman, and cruise missiles. Without tests these armaments would not exist. Existing nuclear weapons would gradually "age." But that is just what Washington does not want.

There is also another reason. The United States is already testing a charge for the nuclear excitation of an X ray laser designed for "star wars." This laser, as it were, "absorbs" the energy of the nuclear explosion and instantly transforms it into powerful radiation to strike targets in space. That is a step not only toward expanding ways of using nuclear weapons, but also toward joining the nuclear and space avenues of the arms race into a single entity. Washington's second action in August is also part of this course.

ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS. The missile which is to be launched from an F-15 aircraft in September to shoot down a disabled satellite is the new combat system of space strike armaments (ASAT). It is planned to complete tests on it rapidly -- by 1987. Then will come the deployment of ASAT, the scale and pace of which will be exceptionally complicated to control: The United States has hundreds of F-15 aircraft and they can be reequipped in just a few hours to launch antisatellite missiles.

WHY THE HURRY WITH THE TESTS? White House Press Secretary L. Speaks says: The tests must be carried out right now. An obvious reference to the forthcoming third round of the Geneva talks. "The administration," G. Brown, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology, said in this connection, "believes that it will thus show the Russians its firmness and show that it has trump cards which will force the USSR to make concessions at the conference table. But the Russians' reaction is the exact opposite."

A correct assessment: Attempts to pressure Moscow have never succeeded; they have merely made dialogue more difficult. This is especially true in the present military-political situation, which is characterized by the close link between space problems and nuclear problems. After all, it is obvious that the missiles launched against space-based targets will also be aimed at the talks themselves. They will make it even more difficult to reach accords on the agenda outlined in Geneva in January. "How can the President seriously assert that he is fulfilling the demands for conscientious talks," Congressman E. Markey said, "if the administration does not believe that control over antisatellite systems is in our interests? What then will we talk about in Geneva?"

R. McFarlane also indicated another "reason" for the rush to test the ASAT system: "catching up with the Russians." The argument is not an original one. But, one wonders how the President's aid would then explain the USSR's readiness not only to ban each sides' antisatellite armaments, but to also abolish them? After all, according to Washington's militarist logic, the side with superiority in particular armaments should not have been the first to propose to destroy them. But the proposal was made! The U.S. leaders are prepared to sacrifice even their own logic as long as they can parrot firmly learned formulas about "Soviet superiority" in all military fields and thus try to justify their dashes forward in the arms race.

THE RESULT: THE ABM TREATY IS JEOPARDIZED. This treaty does not formally concern antisatellite weapons. But the danger of its being undermined lies in the fact that the antisatellite systems tests the United States is planning would in fact be a preliminary stage for tests banned by the ABM Treaty. Antisatellite and ABM armaments systems can have the same technical units. "The ABM and ASAT technologies partially

overlap," the major U.S. expert W. Panofsky asserts. "It is technically easier to use any radiation weapon to perform offensive antisatellite missions than in complex ABM systems. A ban on further tests would prevent the use of equipment with 'ASAT' written on it to circumvent the ABM Treaty." And to renounce the fundamental ABM Treaty would be tantamount to the collapse of the entire disarmament process.

It is this "circumvention" of the treaty under the flag of launching antisatellite missiles into space that the Pentagon is planning. Plans to create an antisatellite system using lasers have already been made public. From there, it is just one step to a laser ABM system.

AN ONSLAUGHT BOTH DANGEROUS AND FUTILE. The world is now at a crossroads: Will there be a sharp improvement in the military-political situation -- not only at the level of the USSR and the United States, but also on an international scale -- or will there be an unprecedented deterioration of this situation? It is a matter of long-term trends determined by what are called current, specific actions by both sides. After all, the present tests of antisatellite weapons, for instance, are not an ordinary phenomenon in the chain of the arms update. It is a case of the start of a new round of "America's rearmament," of its emergence into space. Washington is gambling for very high stakes here: creating for the first time, a large-scale combat system of antisatellite armaments. This is of itself a qualitatively new phenomenon in the military-political situation. But its importance is aggravated by the prospects of its growth into an even more formidable phenomenon -- the creation of ABM space armaments.

The same can be said of the importance of the latest nuclear explosions. Every explosion may not simply be "x plus one;" as has already been pointed out, over 750 explosions have been carried out in the United States. Each explosion can be designed for the subsequent "nuclearization" of space. The successes in tests which are now being carried out and which are ultimately directed into space can only strengthen the position of those people in the United States who have no intention of renouncing the militarization of space, who refuse to heed the Soviet Union's justified warning, and who have taken the bit between their teeth, as they say.

That is the qualitatively new nature of the threat which the world is now experiencing. Now, this is a nuclear threat from space. The sword of Damocles, which has been looming over the world for four decades and which we all have traditionally called a nuclear sword, is acquiring a sinister new appearance. The reflections of "star wars" are flashing on it.

The creation of space strike armaments, antisatellite and ABM armaments, must be categorically banned if there is indeed a desire to preserve and accelerate strategic stability, to avoid undermining military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, and to rule out the very idea of delivering a first (disarming) strike. The prevention of the creation of these armaments is the key to a radical reduction of nuclear potentials. These are facts which it is to be assumed Washington is aware of. So you cannot help forming the impression that that is precisely why it is doing everything the other way around. This is the paradox of present-day, militarist, thinking "American style." That is a tremendous danger for the destiny of peace, as last August reaffirmed.

Only madmen or the politically color-blind could fail to notice the red light on the path of the arms race or even take it for a green light. "Some people in the United States evidently thought that an opportunity had emerged for overtaking us and bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union," M.S. Gorbachev noted in his interview with TIME magazine. "But that is an illusion. This was not achieved in the past, nor will it be achieved now. We will find a response, and an entirely adequate one. But then all talks will be buried and I do not know when we could return to them. Perhaps this prospect suits the U.S. military-industrial complex, but in any event we do not intend to work to its advantage."

CSO: 5200/1002

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

16 OCT 85
cush